► TORTURE SQUADS FOR U. S.

PROTESTANT DIGEST

No. 6 May 1939

Pius XI
Franco's Mercy
Jim-Crow Union ?
I am a Chaplain
Pius XII and the Axis
► Poison in the Melting Pot
Free China Gets to Work
Mart, Rostrum, Arena, Temple ?
► Window to Father Thorning
"Unser Kampf" for Jew and Gentile
Modernism and the Roman Church
► Don't Wait for the Superman
Progressive Episcopalians
God Has Gone Under
From the Lips of a Priest
Lost Tribe

25c

"We have neither reservation nor restraint in commending this excellent vehicle of information and inspiration." **J. A. MacCallum,** Editor Presbyterian Tribune.

PROTESTANT DIGEST

Table of Contents for MAY, 1939

God Has Gone Under .... **Editorial** 1
Window to Father Thorning 3
Progressive Episcopalians 12
Get Busy or Dwindle .... **Expository Times** 15
Free China Gets to Work .... **Pearl S. Buck** 19
Macmurray's Personalism .... **Expository Times** 24
Modernism and the Roman Church .... **J. W. Poynter** 26
Pius XI .... **J. A. MacCallum** 35
Pius XII and the Axis .... **G. A. Borgese** 39
Voices of Hate .... **John van Schaick, Jr.** 47
Torture Squads for U. S. .... **D. Boorstin, G. Mayberry, J. Rackliffe** 49
Pot and Kettle .... **C. G. Montefiore** 58
"Unser Kampf" for Jews and Gentiles .... **A. M. Smith** 66
Poison in the Melting Pot .... **George Britt** 68
Don't Wait for the Superman .... **M. M. Coady** 74
Mart, Rostrum, Arena, or Temple .... **Dan B. Brummitt** 77
Jim-Crow Union? .... **W. Scott Chinn** 81
From the Lips of a Priest .... **Father Lobo** 83
I Am a Chaplain .... **W. Edgar Gregory** 87
Franco's Mercy .... **Georges Bidault** 90
A Line on our Contributors 92
Letters to the Editor 93
Theology 94

Protestant Digest is published monthly at 14 Beacon Street, Boston, Massachusetts,
by Protestant Digest, Inc.; Kenneth Leslie, Editor.
On Sale at Leading News and Book Stores — 25¢ the copy.
By Mail — twelve monthly issues — $3.00.

PROTESTANT DIGEST

KENNETH LESLIE, *Editor*

Editorial Advisors

Vida Dutton Scudder	Reinhold Niebuhr
James Luther Adams	Douglas V. Steere
William Ernest Hocking	Jerome Davis

Vol. I May, 1939 No. 6

GOD HAS GONE UNDER

I am no believer in a cold rationalism. My belief is that passions warp always to a deeper passion. There is a passion for the truth. That passion as it abandons one after another of the faces and substitutes and guarantees of truth which have been set up in the temporal garments truth has worn at some particular point of history; as it quite completely gives itself to the Unnamable Spirit which shapes forth truth ever newly in some fresh temporal garment, — that passion thus utterly abandoned even by the very lineaments of the face of the Father Himself, grows deeper and deeper until it cries out in its Gethsemane "My God, why hast thou forsaken me?"

There is no passion deeper, more moving, than the passion for reality. Once tasted, the "meat ye know not of" is never forgotten. No other sustenance can take its place, no lesser loyalty (to church, to country, to kinfolk) can shake that memory. Not even the sweep and sway of a new ethical doctrine, however exalted, can quite obliterate the imprint of the meeting of soul and Soul, reality aware of Reality deep calling to Deep.

It is that passion for truth with which our youngsters must be infected. Yielding to truth is yielding to God, whether God's name be recognized or not. The philosopher Maritain feels that Russia may be the home of the coming "New Christendom." Is this feeling due to the fact that in Russia there are perhaps fewer pre-conceptions than in the rest of the tradition-crusted world, that in Russia there are perhaps fewer idols to break?

In Russia there is the memory of a great meeting with Reality, a terrible breaking of the Ikon, beautiful though it was. May it not be that French rationalism and Russian materialism were but the cries of two peoples in the agony of a new and bitter discovery of Reality, crying out, "My God, why hast Thou forsaken me?"

There are times in history when God rides out beyond the ken of human beings, when the "God"-men know Him not, yet ever and ever shout His Name louder and louder to convince themselves of an experience they never had. To their cultured congregations they deprecate the unseemly manners of truth's pioneers, and in their communion hate-fests they call to their father the Devil, calling him "God." But God has gone under the rim of their horizons for a time. Alone He goes deep through the dark of the mind where He leads but is not recognized. It is at such a time that we live. God never moves greatly in history without the Devil taking advantage of that movement. This happened in France. It frightened Burke. It frightened Wordsworth. This happened in Russia. It frightens many who hailed the Revolution at first with enthusiasm.

Shall we, the church of Christ, then allow His name to be placed at the head of world reaction as has been done so often before? Or shall we claim and attach His name to His reality as it moves men to express concretely their *real brotherhood.* It is important. Not that we believe in the magic of the word. But *integrity in beings endowed with self-consciousness is dependent upon integrity in the use of words.* Words are all we have to identify experiences and to value experiences. Deep in the conscience of the race Christ stands for the deepest values. This despite the fact that the most horrible crimes have been committed, the most callous cruelty has been practiced, in His name. Right now, for one of thousands of instances, people bearing His name and acting in His name, indulge their evil natures in ridiculing the features of Jews, in gloating over a future massacre of Jews here in America. I cite this as an example not merely of evil, but as an example of the misuse of words, the degradation of the symbol, the shameful robing of the Devil in the white robes of Christ. It might shock the innocent victims of such masquerade to see Christ face to face, to find him without form or comeliness, with the very features derided now in His name. To give Christ natural beauty according to our particular standards of natural beauty is the beginning of blasphemy. It is one of those substitutions mentioned in the first paragraph. It is a betrayal. It is a shifting of landmarks. It is an undoing of the work of Christ which was to identify the way of life, the road to reality. It is a greater rejection of Christ than the rejection of Christ by the Jews. And ironically today the Jews are finding Christ as Christians lose Him. They are finding Him in their climactic experience of the true nature of *race ambition.* They have seen enough now of self-chosen "God-people." Their cup is full. In a recent number we copied down from the daily newspaper the words of two rabbis, words of forgiveness for the persecutions in Europe, almost words Christ could have used. Those words expressed the beginning of the crumbling of spiritual pride.

WINDOW TO FATHER THORNING

The following correspondence with Father Thorning, the well-known lecturer and teacher, will furnish a window into the mental and moral apparatus of one of the tools of a powerful propaganda which is being carried out in the United States to the ultimate end of substituting a "Christian State" for our liberal democracy.

One of the painful necessities in a democracy is that the people should not lose the power to think. If you have read "The Flowering of New England," you will realize that in New England the power to think has largely disappeared. Some people *do* think at Harvard, but they think in a vacuum, unaffected by the cultural desert which surrounds them. The Thornings, the Coughlins, as well as the Protestant "Know-nothings" allied to them, — all these are "beneath the dignity of notice."

But liberty is costly. It costs mass education. It costs the power on the part of a majority of the people to perceive the fallacy in a piece of false reasoning. For instance, (see Father Thorning's first letter), the fact of a Communist revolt in the Spanish Republic (a *revolt* which was suppressed *by* the Spanish Republic) would suggest that the *Spanish Republic itself could not have been Communist,* however strong a minority of Communists there may have been in it.

A man who sets up an idol offers up his reason to that idol. An idol is a thing less than God and debases him who serves it. When the reason is made to serve a thing formed and finished (even in part *by* the reason, when, in other words, the reason serves a construction of the reason then reason obstructs itself, then madness begins. Notably is this the case when the construction is a church. Of all construction the church should be the most humble, most casual in its attachment to particular form, because man should in the church be most keenly aware of the weakness of the finite to express the Infinite. The church should be the one place where honest makers can meet and bow to Him through Whom they make their world. But they cannot meet if they set up their little philosophical, sociological, musical, dramatic, or literary efforts as ultimates of expression. Nor can they meet if one group of them sets up its particular historical institution as an ultimate. This is indeed the worst idolatry. This is indeed the lowest form of snobbery. And its fruit may be seen in all churches, bitterest, I believe, in the oldest and most pretentious churches.

Protestantism was a movement away from pretension and still is. If ecumenicity should prove to be movement towards pretension, then it would be better if Protestantism were smashed into a thousand pieces. Protestantism protests *against* pretension.

It has always been the habit of pretentious institutions to dispose of opposition by disposing of opponents. Disposing of an enemy's character disposed of his arguments. If that didn't work there were always the enemy's books which could be burned. And then lastly, truth could be saved by restraining the enemy's body. The power to punish heretics is still claimed by the Roman Catholic Church.

CORRESPONDENCE BETWEEN FATHER JOSEPH F. THORNING AND THE EDITOR

From Thorning, March 10, 1939

Would you care to publish an analysis of the garbled quotations assembled by Mr. Jay Allen in your March issue?

If you are aware of the circumstances that surrounded the resignation of Mr. Lawrence Fernsworth from the *Times* (London) and from his part-time employment with *The New York Times,* you will be able to understand why he, like Mr. Allen, would welcome the opportunity of resuming newspaper work with some first-class journal of the standing and standards of either *The Times* or *The New York Times.*

The Communistic revolt in Spain, a subject upon which Mr. Allen has been strangely silent, appears to afford daily confirmation of the view of those citizens of the Protestant and Catholic faith who particularly defended the policy of our national government to maintain the embargo on arms to Spain. Mr. Allen's failure on this and other issues may account for his disturbed emotional condition. He is probably in a more overwrought condition now. I am sorry for him, even though occasionally I am obliged to place his writing in correct perspective.

To Thorning, March 11, 1939.

I will be glad to have your article which, although we cannot guarantee publication, would receive favorable consideration.

From Thorning, March 12, 1939

I'll try to get time to submit a piece analyzing the remarks of Mr. Allen.

It may be that I am mistaken on the Spanish issue. If so, I am wrong in some excellent Protestant company.

To Thorning, March 14, 1939

I shall not refer in this letter to the Spanish tragedy. I, too, like Mr. Allen am overwrought.

I am sorry you keep such bad Protesant company.

From Thorning, March 14, 1939

Enclosed please find the MSS. which I promised. I believe you will agree that the analysis is authentic, just. I feel sorry for both Allen and Fernsworth. They had swell assignments in Europe. (A copy of a letter by Fr. Thorning to the Washington *Star* was enclosed.)

To Thorning, March 15, 1939

I am returning as you wished the letter which you wrote to the editor of the *Washington Star*. Among the list of people you call "true liberals" I find the name of Mr. H. L. Mencken. If H. L. Mencken is a true liberal I am my Aunt Emma's cat. You state, too, that this gentleman is also a Protestant. You know better, Father Joe, than to say such things. Why do you do it?

As to Franco's being a Catholic, that be on your own head. Jacques Maritain is better informed, I believe, than you are, although here again I really think you know better. The only explanation I can think of for your going on the way you do is that you have been given an assignment and like a good soldier, "yours not to reason why." I also return your clipping.

Now as to your article, do you not think it would be in your better interests not to have this printed in the Digest? It seems to me it would be a distinct disservice to you to print it. In no sense do you answer the paragraph in Allen's article in which you are presumably called to account for statements regarding the origin of the Spanish war. You use up ten paragraphs and a great deal of space but do not mention the origin of the Spanish war.

Next as to your statement about non-combatants. What Mr. Allen said you said, and what you said you said are virtually one and the same thing. You are not essentially misquoted.

As to the Bishops and the hierarchy, that is not germane to this subject. Priests and officials of the Roman Catholic Church are continually writing in the papers, signing themselves as priests and officials and teachers or what not. Then if they are called for it, they deny that they are speaking in any sense representative of any institution. They always want it both ways. Your statement regarding Fernsworth is no statement but an insinuation, and your pity smacks of the pity of Franco for a victim. You see, Father Joe, we are not impressed by titles or institutions, even such great institutions as the London *Times*. We believe that if Fernsworth or Allen suffered for telling the truth as they saw it, their reward in self-respect is greater than their loss in employment. I will hold your article, however, until I hear further from you. Possibly you may change your mind and not want it printed.

From Thorning, March 17, 1939

The ayes have it: you are "Aunt Emma's cat." When you shall have fought for and won as many liberal victories as H. L. Mencken you will qualify as editor of the Baltimore *Sun*. Mencken is probably as sincere a Protestant as you are. As to Franco's Catholicity, why not accept the judgment of Pius XII?

You are mistaken in imagining that my interest springs from any motive but a love of truth. In the month of November, 1936, I was dubious about the merit of the Nationalist cause. In the following Spring conflicting press reports convinced me that to learn the facts one must examine the situation at first-hand. Mr. Felix Morley, the Protestant editor of the Washington *Post,* writes that my articles have been "wholly objective." Are you aware that he has published a good deal of copy I submitted to him? The answer is that he has been glad to print every line I wrote on the subject. And no one has suggested that it has been anything but a service to my own reputation and that of the *Post.*

Mr. Allen's final paragraph creates the impression that J. F. T. was unable to answer questions the evening of November 22, 1938. Why did not a single reporter on the scene take note of the alleged silence? My quotations establish that two first-class reporers failed to confirm Mr. Allen's impression.

If what I said and what Mr. Allen claims I said are virtually the same thing, why not let your readers judge for themselves? Mr. Allen knew that the context altered the sense and consequently was careful to omit two important qualifying phrases in the original accusation.

Your Protestant Bishops made a definite statement about me and then an attempt was made to back up the statement by an appeal to the Columbia Broadcasting System officials. The latter entered a denial. Why not permit your readers to see it?

The fact that you are not eager to publish my analysis, which is based exclusively upon Protestant, neutral sources, suggests that the reply is much more effective than I had hoped.

To Thorning, March 18, 1939

You ask the question "why did not a single reporter on the scene take note of the alleged silence?" Ask any reporter and he will tell you that it is not his business to take notes on silences. The fact that your first class reporters fail to confirm Mr. Allen's impressions in no way lessens the truth of the impressions. Do you categorically deny that you ignored the origins of the Spanish war on the occasion in question?

The only way to *prove* what you and the announcer said at your broadcast would be either to play a phonographic record of the broadcast or to have a stenographic record of what was said. Are the officials of the Columbia Broadcasting System more credible than three score Protestant Bishops? The CBS's statement is not evidence.

Your last paragraph is quite superfluous. Your insinuations regarding Fernsworth and Allen plus your crocodile sorrow for them are equally superfluous. (This refers to a paragraph in Father Thorning's letter, which, in his own interest, we omit.)

NEUTRAL TESTIMONY

By JOSEPH F. THORNING

My respect and esteem for numerous Protestant friends, both clerical and lay, inspires me to essay an analysis of the statements made by Mr. Jay Allen in the March issue of the Protestant Digest.

In this analysis I will submit the text of Mr. Allen's remarks and then compare his interpretation with the judgment of competent, trustworthy Protestants who were in a position, either as auditors, eye-witnesses, or first-hand investigators, to evaluate the evidence presented on both sides.

Here is the final paragraph of Mr. Jay Allen's article:

"At a Foreign Policy Association dinner in New York on the night of November 22, 1938, Father Thorning was asked to justify some of his statements regarding the origins of of the Spanish war. Reference was made to statements appearing in the official biographies of Franco, Mola, and others, published in Rebel Spain, that quite demolish Thorning's own claims. He had no answer to make to any such questions."

Fortunately, two leading New York newspapers, *The New York Times* and *The New York Herald-Tribune*, had reporters who heard the discussion on the evening of November 22, 1938. Their reports appeared at some length in both newspapers the next morning, November 23, 1938. Neither of the reporters was a Catholic. Nor was one or the other, to the best of my knowledge, biassed with reference to the speakers or the subject-matter.

Here is the report of the *New York Times* reporter:

"More than a score of questioners rose when the discussion period opened, most of them with queries addressed to the Catholic teacher. Answering a challenge to name three churches in Spain destroyed by mobs since Jan. 1, 1937 — the date set by the interrogator as that of the restoration of order by Madrid — he specified three in Castellon, which he said he visited this year.

"According to townspeople and judging by the state of the religious images, crucifixes and church rooms, where horses had been stabled, he said, the buildings were wrecked by crowds, and not by aerial bombardment by the rebels.

"Dr. Thorning denied categorically that the church was in "alliance" with Fascism anywhere and recommended that those who protested religious persecution in Germany 'pay the same attention to that in Mexico and Soviet Russia.'

"Franco, he said in reply to another inquiry, has guaranteed religious freedom to all sects in Spain, including the Jews, and he contrasted the pledge with the situation under the Loyalist government which, he said, permitted religious services to be held only for congregations numbering twenty or fewer."

The first to deny Mr. Allen's assertions, according to the reporter of the *New York Herald-Tribune,* was a distinguished member of the Protestant faith, Mr. Merwin K. Hart, president of the New York State Economic Council and chairman of the American Union for Nationalist Spain. The report of the question-period reads as follows:

"When the floor was thrown open for discussion Mr. Hart rose to deny that he was a special pleader or that he had been invited to go to Spain. He said that he had found the 'utmost order' in Nationalist Spain and that 'after five years of disorder and crime the Spanish people have welcomed the restoration of order.'

"A long and inconclusive dispute between Mr. Allen and Dr. Thorning was started when John Gunther, author of 'Inside Europe,' asked for information about the story that 4,000 Loyalists had been massacred in the bull ring at Badajoz. Mr. Allen, who reported the story, admitted he had not witnessed the massacre, but said the story was supported by Portuguese journalists, who on the whole were sympathetic to Franco. Dr. Thorning maintained that Mr. Allen had produced no sufficient evidence on which to base the story."

These two reports, fair, complete, judicial, suggest that Mr. Allen's impression of the discussion is not shared by good reporters. His view of what happened on the night of November 22, 1938, reminds me of his description of Teruel as "the first complete victory of the Republican army."

Speaking over a national network of the Columbia Broadcasting System of the night of Thursday, January 13, 1938, (6:15 to 6:30 P.M.) Mr. Jay Allen insisted that Teruel was "a huge, a tremendous and a decisive victory." The entire text of this speech is in my possession.

Protestants will be deeply interested in the following quotations which have been wrenched from their context by Mr. Allen. Here is the Allen version of my private correspondence and my public speeches and statements:

"In a letter to Mr. George Seldes, January 28, 1928 (Sic!), Father Thorning made the remarkable statement that "the day of the noncombatant has vanished. This is regrettable but it is a fact. . . "

What I really wrote, as Mr. George Seldes acknowledged in the *New York Herald-Tribune* (Tuesday, March 22, 1938) was the following:

"Every expert on war, whether a military officer or a college professor or correspondent, admits that the day of the 'non-combatant' has vanished."

This statement is correct. It has been confirmed by Mr. Louis Johnson, American assistant secretary of war, who is certainly an expert on the question. Feverish preparations to protect the civilian population in Europe and America make it abundantly evident that it would be criminal to deny or ignore the integral character of modern conflict. This is the opinion of experts and, as I stated in my letter to Mr. Seldes, I regret the conditions which make frank acknowledgment of the situation imperative.

Now let us see how my statement was utilized in an appeal issued to the Catholic Hierarchy by sixty-one Bishops of the Methodist and Protestant Episcopal churches. Under their signature (The Associated Press, March 21, 1938) it was charged, in a document that a number of the Protestant Bishops admitted later they had never seen, that I was the "spokesman" referred to in the following declaration:

"We are sure that you, as men of God and followers of our most compassionate Saviour, do not share the expressed view of a man who, claiming to be your spokesman, says with a callousness incredible in one of his calling, that 'the day of the non-combatants has vanished.'

From the record of my correspondence with Mr. George Seldes it is clear that I did not cite the opinion of military experts "with a callousness incredible" in one of my calling. What about the second assertion that I claimed to be a "spokesman" for the Catholic Hierarchy?

Challenged with my prompt denial of this statement (The Associated Press, March 21, 1938), the "American Friends of Spanish Democracy" appealed to an introduction supplied by the Columbia Broadcasting System prior to my radio address, March 18, 1938. This shifted the responsibility for the claim to the officials of the Columbia Broadcasting System, who made the following disclaimer:

"Due to a misunderstanding that has arisen respecting the introduction of Dr. Joseph F. Thorning, chairman of the department of social sciences, Mount St. Mary's College, Emmitsburg, Md., the Columbia Broadcasting System wishes to make perfectly clear that Dr. Thorning did not claim to be a spokesman for the Catholic Hierarchy nor did the Columbia Broadcasting Company make any such claim."

It is on the basis of this evidence, unimpeachable in a court of law or before the bar of public opinion, that I most respectfully submit that those Protestant Bishops who actually read the plea that was issued in their name would render a service to justice and truth by withdrawing the charge that they, innocently I am sure, leveled against a Catholic priest who has friends in almost every Protestant denomination. The responsibility is the greater because in the same plea equally unverifiable accusations were directed against a Protestant gentleman of acknowledged integrity, Mr. Ellery Sedgwick, former editor of the *Atlantic Monthly*.

Mr. Jay Allen suggests that I "play fast and loose with quotations." In the next sentence he alleges that I cited a passage from Jose Ortega y Gasset to show that philosopher's low opinion "of the Spanish Republic of 1931." These words do not occur in the article which Mr. Allen quotes.

A final word about Mr. Lawrence A. Fernsworth. It is true that I wrote in a personal letter to former Congressman Teigan the following description of this former correspondent:

". . .I suppose that Fernsworth is a Catholic in the same sense that Judas is an apostle of Christ. . ."

It is my painful duty to record that, subsequent to my criticism of Mr. Lawrence A. Fernsworth, my opinion of his Catholic character has received most painful, unexpected confirmation. The evidence on Mr. Fernsworth's connections with the Leftist Government of Spain was gathered by agents of the British Foreign Office and led to his resignation both from the *London Times* and the *New York Times*. Needless to say, responsible officials of both newspapers, which in my judgment are unsurpassed both for integrity and news coverage in the English-speaking world, are heart-broken at this development, which must be a tragedy for Mr. Fernsworth and a blow to the ethics of journalism wherever honest reporting is in honor.

There is a moral in this story for every working newspaper man, especially those in foreign parts. The lesson is that it pays rich dividends in self-respect and opportunities for sustained employment to be a good reporter. Mr. Fernsworth, like Mr. Allen, is now an ex-correspondent. They both have my heart-felt sympathy.

NON-COMBATANTS

There can be no doubt from reading the foregoing that Father Thorning agrees that "the day of the noncombatant has vanished," that he recognizes this presumed fact as an excuse for Franco's totalitarian warfare and therefore erects that fact into a principle of modern warfare. In Franco's case he does not denounce the employment of such a principle, although he does 'regret' it. In the case of priest-killing on the other hand he becomes righteously indignant and denies to his 'un-Christian' enemy the use of his 'Christian' principle.

Father Thorning's agreement with this principle when it is used by his side is typical of the moral alliance between totalitarian church-ism and totalitarian state-ism, a moral alliance which follows upon the political alliance inevitably and tragically.

It is one thing to recognize the fact that certain states have erected the principle of bullying into an absolute principle and have developed the technique of moral enslavement into a fine art. It is quite another thing to make that fact an apology for the employment of such principles in the establishment of the "Christian State."

Protestants have been counselled often enough by their Roman Catholic friends to "let bygones be bygones" and not to be forever dragging up and rehearsing medieval practices such as the Inquisition. We have heeded the counsel in the hope that sooner or later the Roman Church would explicitly turn her back upon her oft-claimed and still-claimed right to use force in the advancement of her purposes.

Spain has taught us our hopes were founded on deceit. Crying 'Peace!' throughout the world she has urged on the dogs of war in that unhappy country.

Idealogical absolutists, church monopolists, totalitarians of whatever kind, are malignant growths in a democracy. It is for them to face this fact and to square themselves with it.

PROGRESSIVE EPISCOPALIANS

Bill Spofford calls for "embargo and boycott of the aggressors."

A vigorous defense of the Wagner Act and other progressive legislation, and a challenge to democratically-minded people to press forward to still further achievements, was the keynote of a brilliant address by Mr. Edwin S. Smith of the National Labor Relations Board, delivered at the annual meeting of the Church League for Industrial Democracy, held in Boston February 12-13.

The present attack on the National Labor Relations Act, he declared, was merely a symptom of current reaction that is manifest also in the cutting down of the WPA funds and the continuation of the reactionary Dies Committee. "There never was a time in our history," said the speaker, "when the need for clear and honest thinking about labor, civil liberties, and the implications of a liberal philosophy generally was more necessary. Day by day the newspapers remind us of the onward march of Fascism in Europe and Asia and the Fascist penetration of Latin America. Those who read current history with a modicum of intelligence know that the United States is in grave danger not only from the ultimate menace of armed aggression, but from the immediate menace of those in our own country, who, in the name of combatting subversive activities, conceal but faintly their hostility to a liberal program."

Inviting Disaster

"For government," he continued, "to cease to go forward under such circumstances is to invite disaster. Fascism's appeal to an undernourished and discontented populace, disappointed by the failure of government to answer its problems by democratic means, has been all too clearly illustrated in the experience of Germany and Italy. There is no reason to suppose that such an experience might not be repeated in our country. That is why it is of paramount importance that labor, which has most to fear from Fascism, be assured of the guaranties of freedom to organize in order to promote its economic interests, which it enjoys under the National Labor Relations Act, and that that freedom be not diminished by crippling amendments.

From The Churchman, *March 1, 1939*

"But labor, even with the protection of the act, cannot with our present widespread unemployment maintain and extend its economic status unless government continues to care for the unemployed through adequate appropriations for work on useful projects. Any attack on the standard of living, just as an attack on the right to organize, will lay the groundwork for cynicism and despair; states of mind which the Fascist-minded demagogue will be quick to seize upon and adapt to his own uses.

Harvest of Intolerance

"The technique of certain agencies and influences now at work to destroy faith in democracy is only too clear. As was done in Germany and Italy, the device of alarming ill-informed people by charges that labor movements are engineered and dominated by Communists has already reaped a dangerous harvest of intolerance. This is not only reflected in denunciation of organized labor, but includes a much more ferocious and widespread anti-Semitism than most of us dare to admit.

"The battle between reaction and social advance," Mr. Smith concluded, "is approaching a major test of the opposing forces. But with courage, clear thinking and constant education, the struggle can be won by the friends of civilization and humanity."

World Peace

The Rev. W. B. Spofford, executive secretary of CLID, declared that an extension of democracy into industrial areas is necessary if any democracy is to be preserved. He presented an analysis of present trends toward Fascism in the United States, and also declared that for both economic and moral reasons we could not isolate ourselves from European affairs.

"Ocean barriers and our traditions of isolation are not enough to protect us from Fascism, which is a diabolical philosophy of life as well as a system of government. There should be a united front of the peoples of democratic countries against it. We should cease strengthening the aggressor nations by supplying them the goods to carry on. Aid to the victims, an embargo and boycott of the aggressors — in other words the reversal of the present foreign policy of our government, is required if we are to exert a moral influence in this shattered world."

New Constitution

Wholehearted endorsement was given to the Wagner Act in its present form; Congress was called upon to support the President in his demand for the restoration of cuts in WPA funds; adequate federal laws to combat lynching were called for, and disapproval expressed of racial discrimination in governmental agencies and bureaus; members were urged to write the President and their Senators urging an appropriation in order that the La Folette Civil Liberties Committee may be continued; the efforts of the Newspaper Guild to better conditions in the industry were endorsed, and entire sympathy expressed with the guild in its present struggle against the Hearst papers in Chicago and the newspapers in Wilkes-Barre.

AND NOW, DEAR CHILDREN

By E. R. BOWEN

This morning, dear children, you are about to learn the "why and wherefore of our American way of living" through the kindness of your dear friends the National Association of Manufacturers of the United States of America.

"Two kinds of government have developed . . . the first individualistic, the second collectivistic . . . the American is individualistic. . . Under the American system we have freedom and equality of opportunity."

What is your question, Willy? You want to know why in this America of equal opportunity your father cannot get a job? It is because the collective theorists interfere with the practical process of individualism, Willy. Now let me read on.

"The ability of the consumer to buy represents the dynamic force of the system."

Your question, Lily? You ask why mother hasn't the ability to buy more to eat and wear? Well, I'm sorry, but we cannot talk about such personal matters in school."

Those who like this sample and wish to learn more about "The American Way" and "The American Standard of Living," etc., etc., can get free copies of eight such booklets beautifully printed and illustrated and full of such economic bunk from cover to cover by writing for "You and Industry Series" to 14 West 49th St., New York City. It is surely high time that cooperators in other states offset this propaganda by following the example of Wisconsin, Minnesota and North Dakota and providing for the teaching of the true economic facts to their children.

From CONSUMER'S COOPERATION, *February 1939*

GET BUSY OR DWINDLE

—"In effective preaching the note of personal testimony is always present."

THE DOGMATIC atheism of Communism and the idolatrous worship of the nation are only the culminating expressions of a temper and attitude that have been for centuries the real driving force of the Western world. And the hope of a better world is looked for in man's capacity through knowledge to control and shape the world. The Church is far too little alive to the fact that through the progress of the social sciences, through the increasing correlation of different branches of knowledge and through the growingly efficient organization of research, man is steadily acquiring a power to mould the lives of human beings which has greater potentialities, for good and for evil, than his control over physical nature.

In comparison with this unhalting, relentless, triumphant, scientific control of life, our methods of religious influence appear antiquated and homespun, as little fitted to survive in face of the masterful scientific direction and organization of life as village industries and crafts in an age of machine production. Science seems to have made God irrelevant to human life. It offers an alternative means of overcoming physical, social, and even moral evil.

But that is only one side of the picture. Notwithstanding these amazing and intoxicating achievements, it is only too evident that all is not well. We find ourselves in a social crisis which threatens the existence of European civilization. Wide spread unemployment is destroying the bodies and souls of men. Instead of becoming master of the world, man is in danger of being enslaved to the machines he has invented and of becoming the plaything of the forces he has brought into existence. There is in wide circles a growing sense of the meaninglessness of life. Man has lost his sense of direction. He finds himself sinking in a mass of relativities. It is partly to escape the burden of responsibility that men seek refuge in a blind surrender to the community.

What has the Church to offer in this situation? First of all, the Church is committed to a view of the nature of man totally at variance with the assumptions of the self-

From Notes of Recent Exposition, in THE EXPOSITORY TIMES, *March 1939* reliant humanism which has created the modern world, with its splendours, its sickness, and its doubts. In the Christian view man is not the master of his own fate. He is a created and dependent being. His existence, his true nature as man, is based on his relation to God. There is an objective truth and justice to which he is meant to conform, and only through such conformity can he achieve his true manhood. Take away that belief (which is widely denied) and you leave nothing to which final appeal can be made except force, and deprive man of that which makes him distinctively human and has been the spring and inspiration of all his strivings towards a higher life.

Whether this view of man is true or not it is of infinite importance to mankind. It is at the same time a decisive challenge to the assumptions and practical beliefs of modern society. If it were only believed it would create a real revolution in the life of mankind. What really matters, what is fundamentally necessary, is a reorientation of men's lives in the light of their relation to God. This is the first point at which the Christian faith challenges the whole thought and behaviour of contemporary society, that the meaning of man's existence is found in his relation to God.

The second thing of supreme importance to be said about the content of the gospel is that it is a *gospel.* It is not primarily a set of ideas or duties, but the story of something that happened in history, something that because it happened has led to a belief about the nature of reality that is staggering and incredible to the natural reason. It is that God by His own act has created a new order of human life in which men are called to live. The gospel is the announcement of a gift, not the presentation of a demand, and it is vital that that order should always be in our mind when we speak of it — not, in the first place, demand, as we incorrigible English moralists are always making it appear, but *gospel.*

The good news which Jesus proclaimed was that the day of deliverance and redemption — the Kingdom of God — was at hand. Its powers were already operative, though its full realization lay in the future. Two 'moments' in this message were the forgiveness of sins, which is central in the Christian message, and, what is equally important, a new life, a life of sonship. That is clearly what the gospel means in the New Testament. The early Christians were conscious, like their Master, of the presence and working of supernatural forces. They lived with Christ in heavenly places. The advent of the New Age manifested itself in a new quality of life, the character and meaning of which is love.

This brings us to the third conception in the Christian understanding of life which has immeasurable consequences for the life of our time. It is in the sphere of relations between persons, and not in the immensities and unfathomable mysteries of Nature, that God makes Himself known. By His grace God has communicated to us a responsible selfhood. And the response which He asks of us is to love and serve Him in other men. This faith, that the end of human existence is a community of love based on God's creative love to us, has the power to redeem our civilization from its menacing one-sidedness and to restore to it health and sanity and a satisfying meaning.

Why, then, if it has this power, does it come about that a message of such profound significance should have so little force and punch and bite? Why do assertions that transform entirely the meaning of human existence, and that should kindle in men's minds the flame of a living hope, leave them in fact so largely unmoved? Why does the world go its way in all the manifold activities of the common life unperturbed and unchallenged by the startling and revolutionary affirmations of Christian faith? Till we have faced these profoundly relevant questions we have not got to the real heart of the subject of the content of the gospel.

The answer to them is twofold. The first answer is suggested by the Pope's question in Browning's *The Ring and the Book* — 'well, is the thing we see salvation?' It is the misfortune of the preacher that he has to deal largely in words. And the temptation is always present to substitute words for realities. The Kingdom of God is a realm of *power*. It brings salvation in this present life. It is the actual experience of victory over sin, failure, weakness, and circumstance. And where this is lacking the gospel is no more than a lovely song. In all effective Christian preaching the note of personal testimony is always present. And our fundamental need in regard to the content of the gospel is to rediscover the meaning in actual experience.

The second reason which makes it difficult for men to-day to take seriously the preaching of the gospel has to do with the whole structure of modern society. It is the contradiction between the affirmations of the Christian faith and the ends, institutions, and practices of the society in which we live, and therefore one thing that is imperative is that we must create a society which is in accordance with the Christian understanding of the meaning and end of man's existence. If we do not, religion will be relegated to a sphere of unreality, unrelated to the actual life which men have to live. In a society which is assuming responsibility for ordering the lives of its members it is vain to proclaim the gospel merely in words. Where doctrine and practice, word and act, are in fundamental contradiction, religion is bound to appear unreal. The Church in modern society is thus faced with an inevitable and inexorable choice. It must either be content to administer the consolation of an other-worldly religion to a small and dwindling minority of the population, or it must gird itself to a bold and energetic effort to transform the institutions and activities of the community in accordance with Christian understanding of the nature and destiny of man.

"*ECONOMIC DEMOCRACY IS USERS' OWNERSHIP*"

In his annual address as Secretary of the Ohio Farm Bureau Federation, Murray D. Lincoln defined democracy in business as follows:

"My understanding of economic democracy is the ownership and control of economic institutions by the people who use their services." "Users' ownership" is a good phrase. It is all-inclusive. It covers individual ownership of farms and homes. It covers ownership by cooperatively organized consumers and producers of the businesses and banks which they "use." It covers ownership by the people of the utilities which they "use." A "users-owned" world is what cooperators intend to organize.

From CONSUMER'S COOPERATION, *February 1939*

FREE CHINA GETS TO WORK

By PEARL S. BUCK *"—grandsons of the old craftsmen."*

China is at last beginning her real offensive against Japan. It is characteristically not an offensive of arms but of industry. In doing this she is meeting Japan's attack at its most crucial point. For Japan's keenest thrust at China has not been military but economic. When the Japanese insist that they do not want Chinese territory, they are probably speaking the truth. What they want is China's life — that is, the trade and resources which have made and kept China a great and powerful nation for so many centuries. Japan has come to China not as other conquerors have come, to seize land or a throne. She has come with the definite goals of taking China's trade and industries and possessing her natural resources.

The economic front is the one on which China has been most nearly defeated. If the Chinese can survive this war economically they can win it. To lose cities has been not too important, to lose land has not been too catastrophic. What is close to catastrophe is the fact that the rapidly growing heavy industry of the past two decades in China is now, seventy per cent of it, either destroyed or in Japanese control, and Japanese trade with China is alarmingly on the increase. Two thousand Japanese merchants and industrialists come to China every month. In the occupied cities ninety-five per cent of the goods bought and sold are Japanese. The very cloth which makes the uniforms for many Chinese soldiers is bought from Japan.

The sad truth is that China may be furnishing the means for her own conquest.

Some of China's most alert minds are now at work upon the problem of how to combat Japan industrially. Warfare goes on and must go on, but it is accepted that China cannot compete with Japan in arms. Guerrilla warfare will be ceaseless, but at best it will not solve the problem of Japanese occupation. For there is a force working for Japan against which even the bravest guerrillas are helpless. It is the fact that with the destruction of industry, both large and small, millions of people are hungry and homeless. These people in their despair flock to Jap-

From Asia, *April, 1939*

anese-established industry in their own territory. They and their children must eat, even though the enemy feed them.

The one weapon, therefore, against Japan's increasing possession of China's economic life is the establishment as quickly as possible by the Chinese themselves of new centers of industry which can absorb the many working people now without work and set them again to producing Chinese goods for Chinese to use. This is more than mere relief. It is an act of real aggression against Japan, because it sets up competition for Japanese goods and utilizes Chinese resources, both natural and human, which would otherwise out of sheer necessity empty themselves into Japan's industrial stream. The Chinese have long known that if China can keep possession of her own raw materials and her own markets, Japan will be defeated in the main purpose of the war. As the great industrial cities along the Yangtze fell one by one, they planned to move the remaining plants inland, to cities farther up the river. But Japan settled this by bombing Chungking, Chengtu, Yunnanfu. All of China's large cities have now been proved within Japan's bombing reach. Bankers and technical experts have come to a common conclusion — that the new industrial movement must be made in small units, financed coöperatively.

So there is heartening news from China — the most heartening for many months. There is now being organized in China a vast scheme of coöperative industry, to make use of as many as possible of the millions of war refugees and especially of the factory workers of Shanghai and other cities, nearly all of them thrown out of work by the invasion.

The plan, in brief, is that in any locality a group of craftsmen may organize into a society, the minimum being seven persons. No member is allowed to own more than twenty per cent of the stock. There are definite rules about buying raw materials and selling products. Profits when they are earned will be divided among the members. Each society is carefully supervised by a central committee, in order to develop self-government and the committee system of self-management. This central committee is the national Industrial Coöperative Commission, sponsored by the Executive Yuan of the central government. It includes some of China's best engineers, technicians and labor organizers, as well as expert foreign advisers.

In the short space of four months four large coöperative headquarters have been set up, two north of the Yangtze and two south, all within free China. They have received large sums, including $5,000,000 Chinese money from the government, a gift of 140,000 *pesos* from Chinese in the Philippines, a loan of $200,000 from patriotic Canton bankers and a few private gifts. Their loans vary from $500 to $10,000 (local currency) and have been granted to coöperatives for producing tanned leather and small boats; for weaving, spinning, printing, mining coal and iron, milling flour, extracting and working metal; making sulphuric acid and converting vegetable oil into fuel substitutes. These are nearly all old industries which modern industry has replaced. In many regions old hand methods had been forgotten as craftsmen found themselves unable to compete with modern machines. In some cases the grandsons of the old craftsmen are now having instruction in an old craft by old methods and the use of primitive tools. Sometimes vast natural resources, not known or simply not worked because of lack of demand, are now being uncovered and put to use. In one region, for instance, imported iron was being sold at a high price, while in the ground were great stores of rich and workable ore.

The plan of the Industrial Coöperative Commission calls for thirty thousand coöperatives, which, if each unit involves directly and indirectly one hundred and fifty producers and their dependent families, will begin a huge relief program and at the same time increase China's dying production and shrinking markets.

Of this plan a good deal has already been accomplished. Chief among the foreign experts, perhaps, is Mr. Rewi Alley, technical advisor. Under his advice, to the Northwest went as organizer Lu Kuangmien, a returned student from Edinburgh who had already had experience in coöperative industry in Honan, and with him as engineer went Wu Chufei of the Shanghai Power Company and the Ford Motor Company in the United States. Machines were sent from Hankow and within three months some eighty small industries were begun. Fuel alcohol, weaving, spinning, knitting, tanning, mining, and transport coöperatives were among them. Villages were lit by electricity, a printing works established the first newspaper in a county seat. The raw materials of the region have been canvassed and a school has been set up for training leaders of industrial coöperatives.

To the Southwest, shortly before the fall of Hankow, went Lem Fohyu, who came from the Shanghai Power Company to head the technical section of the Industrial Coöperative Commission. He had long been an engineer in the United States, and now in western Hunan he gathered around him a band of technicians who made a thorough survey of the raw materials of the region. Shoemaking for the army was needed and begun. Dry-cell making, leather tanning, towel weaving, hosiery knitting, and printing coöperatives have all been successful here, as well as work in medical supplies for hospitals. Society members, when the means of distribution became difficult, went out into villages and sold their products themselves, finding fair profit.

In the Southeast a tannery and leather goods coöperative was the first begun. Other coöperatives now include a machine shop worth about $3,000, spinning and weaving for refugees, printing and cigarette-making coöperatives for crippled soldiers, sugar refining, boat building and food preservation.

The central headquarters for the whole movement is now in Chungking. This headquarters acts nationally and also for the provinces of Hupeh, Szechwan, Sikong and Yunnan. Of raw materials there are plenty in this region, but work has only just begun.

The coöperatives in all regions are proving successful. Profits are generally good. One candle-makers' coöperative in the Northwest was able to pay back $500 in two months on a loan of $2,000, after having met all expenses. Capital is of course sorely needed, for a coöperative must be maintained until it can begin to make profits.

Every Chinese and every friend of China should help in this attack upon the Japanese, on the industrial front. Rich Chinese should give more than they have. The wealthy Chinese overseas have given most generously but it is a shameful and discouraging fact that rich Chinese in China, both in and out of government circles have not given nearly what they should to any form of war relief. A little money goes a hearteningly long way in China. One American woman gave to the coöperatives fifty dollars in United States currency. With it seventeen Chinese-made weaving machines were bought in Hankow and these gave employment to sixty persons in a Shensi unit.

There are many interesting points which come to one's mind in surveying the possibilities of this new industrial movement in China. China's old strength was always in her decentralized industries, the home industries of her villages and families. A few years ago the great English economist R. H. Tawney, in his excellent study of Chinese industry entitled *Land and Labour in China,* made his conclusion that China should, for the economic welfare of her people, stay by her own ancient system of the small industry rather than industrialize in the large centralized fashion of the West. To the latter system, however, she was developing until Japan destroyed her factories. Now she is turning back to the sources of her ancient strength.

The development of industrial coöperatives at the present moment in China is of the utmost meaning. It gives relief and life to the destitute refugees, it maintains a native industry in the face of Japan's foreign economic aggression and, most important of all, it provides a new and inexhaustible source of moral strength and confidence for the Chinese people. It gives work to the working man, to the trained expert and to China's eager young, who are at this time so dismayed because, with all their anxiety to help their country, there is little they can do. Their country has been crumbled beneath their feet because industry has been paralyzed. But by bringing industry back to life in hundreds of places they are staying the destruction. Workingmen and intellectuals can found through coöperatives a new Chinese industry. Together they can fight Japan.

We cannot believe something, be it the word of God Himself, unless we find some sense in the formulas which we believe. And it can hardly be expected that we will believe in God's Revelation, unless we be given good reasons to think that such a Revelation has indeed taken place. As modern theologians would say, there are motives of credibility. . . . Now to believe that God has spoken, and that what God has said is true, is something essentially different from a rational comprehension of the truth which we hold by faith. We *believe* that it is true, but no Christian can hope to *know* at least in this life, the truth which he believes. —E. Gilson summarizing Augustine.

MACMURRAY'S PERSONALISM

—"Love is the only possible basis of human unity."

PROFESSOR John MacMurray's latest book, *The Clue to History* is a notable one. We have found nothing more stimulating for some time. It opens up wide vistas; it casts light upon dark places. It is the kind of book which lifts one to a mountain-peak from which a wide and varied landscape becomes visible. It explains the past, it illumines the present and indicates a pathway to a hopeful future.

The author warns us that we may find in reading some degree of the difficulty he experienced in writing. He has done his best to make his meaning plain, and what illustration can do has been done. We confess that it is a book which cannot be understood with a rapid glance. It is no book for an odd moment or even a railway journey. It is full of meat; and requires, as it deserves, patient study. It abounds in paradox, at each of which the reader will have to pause a few minutes to get his breath back. That is not a fault, it is one of the many merits of the book.

The main thesis is not unfamiliar. It amounts to this: history is meaningless save as the progress of the working out by men of God's purpose with men, namely, the establishment of a universal family of persons — as Kant put it, a Kingdom of Ends. And progress is measurable in proportion to the extent to which successive periods have contributed to the realization of the Divine purpose.

What is exceptional is our author's development of his thesis, the grasp he evidences of past history and contemporaneous happenings, his insight into and explication of the teachings of Jesus. Light is cast on a great variety of themes — the main differences between Greek, Roman, and Hebrew thought, and the vital significance of the last; the achievement and the failure of the Middle Ages; the place of Monasticism; the struggle between Church and State; the real inner meaning of Hitler's war upon the Jews — those are outstanding, and on every one of them Professor MacMurray casts new light.

Our own perplexity is to select any one item for special notice. Let us with acknowledged arbitrariness take part of what is said about the 'discovery' which Jesus made. Jesus, according to our author, discovered

From Notes of Recent Exposition, in the EXPOSITORY TIMES that human life is personal. 'This at least is the form of expression which brings our own way of thinking as near to the heart of the matter as we can get it.' Personality is not individualness, it is what distinguishes human life from all other forms. It makes a difference not of degree, but of kind. This discovery of Jesus was of course implicit in the Old Testament, and in Judaism had been coming nearer the threshold of consciousness. And this discovery of Jesus transformed human history.

When a man discovers his own essence as a human being, the essence of humanity and, for the religious consciousness, the nature of God are discovered.

A society which does justice to 'humanity' will do justice to the two concepts of freedom and equality. Our author's account of essential equality is helpful. The equality in view does not abolish, for example, the master-servant relationship. But that exists only in a limited function, and subordination of one man to another does not involve any personal inequality. 'Superiority of function for a particular purpose only becomes a denial of human equality if it is transferred to the personal field.'

Similarly with regard to economic systems. The ideal of equality neither justifies nor condemns any economic system as such. What it condemns is the idea of caste — a ruling class and a working class, an aristocratic class and a class of commoners. Caste is due to the transference to the personal field of distinctions of function relative to economic purposes. Any economic system can be justified under one condition — 'that it actually does work in the interests of all concerned better than any other that is possible.'

Equality is not always realizable. The important thing is that it should be 'intended.' Equality is neither ideal nor fact, it is a principle of human action. Equality, like freedom, is an immediate corollary of the love which is fundamental — 'love is the only possible basis of human unity.' Without that love, freedom and equality, friendship cannot exist. Nor will any society endure which does violence to them. 'Any society of men which is not based on freedom and equality is not a human community. It is a functional organization for a specific purpose which denies the nature of human relationship; and must therefore frustrate itself and in the long run destroy itself.'

MODERNISM AND THE ROMAN CHURCH

By J. W. POYNTER

—*"The church possesses less certitude than seems at first sight to be hers."*

GLANCING recently through some books on ecclesiastical history, I lighted on two passages which, read together, opened up an interesting train of thought. One of them was from *The Abbe de Lamennais,* by the Hon. W. Gibson (Longmans; 1896; pp. 217-8), and alluded to the shock endured by the great French Catholic apologist when, in the encyclical *Mirari Nos,* Pope Gregory XVI condemned the ideas through which for so many years *Lamennais* had tried to explain Catholicism to the progressive world. 'The blow must have been a terrible one. He had reached the age of fifty, and, with a mature mind, had formed an ideal of the true meaning of the Catholic religion. To him this ideal had become a necessary outcome of his faith. . . To *Lamennais* it was everything, the slow creation of the long years of a painful, struggling life. . . And now all his hopes were shattered, and his whole life must have appeared to him empty and meaningless.' The other passage is from *Recollections of the Last Four Popes,* by Cardinal Wiseman (Hurst and Blackett; 1860; pp. 214-5): 'In de la Mennais there was a long canker deeply sunk. There was a maggot in the core of that beautiful fruit. It was only in 1837, when he finished his ecclesiastical career by his *Affaires de Rome,* that the worm had fully writhed itself out, and wound itself, like the serpent of Eden, round the rind. But it had been there all along. . . : the demon of pride and disappointed ambition. Often has one heard good men say in Rome, what a happy escape the Roman Church had experienced from one who had turned out so worthless!'

The second of these two passages —written by a prelate wearing the honours and purple of ecclesiastical eminence — expresses the authentic scorn of sacerdotalism for liberalism of mind. The two passages, side by side, may well preface any study of Modernism in the Roman Church.

According to the *Catholic Encyclopaedia* (x, 415), the actual technical term, 'Modernism,' is nearly two hundred years old. 'J. J. Rousseau, who treated an atheistical philosopher of his time as a modernist, seems to have been the first to use

From the MODERN CHURCHMAN, *February, 1939* the word in this sense (*i.e.* of 'a radical transformation of human thought in relation to God' and faith): (see *Correspondence a M.D.,* 15 Jan., 1769). Littre (*Dictionnaire*), who cites the passage, explains: "Modernist, one who esteems modern times above antiquity." After that, the word seems to have been forgotten till the time of the Catholic publicist Périn (1815-1905), professor at the University of Louvain, 1844-1889. This writer, whilst apologizing for the coinage, describes "the humanitarian tendencies of contemporary society" as modernism. The term itself he defines as "the ambition to eliminate God from social life." With this absolute modernism he associates a more temperate form, which he declares to be nothing less than 'liberalism of every degree or shade" (*Le Modernisme dans l'Eglise d'après les lettres inédites de Lamennais;* Paris; 1881)'

At the beginning of the present century liberalist tendencies in theology made themselves felt in Italy very vigorously. In a circular letter published at Christmas, 1905, the bishops of the provinces of Turin and Vercelli denounced them as *'il modernismo nel clero'* ('modernism amongst the clergy') However, many even of the rigidly orthodox disliked the use of the term 'modernism.' Mgr. Baudrillart, for example (*Revue pratique d'apologétique* IV, 578) said it implied 'that the Church condemns everything modern.' However, on September 8, 1907, Pope Pius X issued the encyclical *Pascendi Dominici Gregis.* It struck relentless blows at the Liberalizing movements, and was definitely headed *'De Modernistarum Doctrinis'* ('Concerning the Teachings of the Modernists'). Since then, Modernism, definitely under that name, has been banned in the Roman Catholic Church.

No study of modernism in that Church can be even approximately adequate without a carefully accurate realization of Rome's conception of the nature of theological truth. The Vatican Council of 1870 summed up that conception succintly thus (*Constitution concerning the Faith,* chapter 2): 'Further, this supernatural revelation, according to the faith of the universal Church, declared by the holy Council of Trent, is contained in the written books and unwritten traditions received from the mouth of Christ Himself or which, dictated by the Holy Ghost to the Apostles themselves, have been handed down, so to speak, hand by hand and have come down to us.'

That is to say, revelation is divine truth clearly and definitely expressed in human words. It is not a mere sentiment, or a cloudy dream, or a series of indefinite ideas. It is truth expressed in permanent verbal categories. That being so, it is not surprising that Pope Pius X, having to express a decision on some forms of modernism which found the truth rather in subjective experience than in objective facts, should declare (Encyclical *Pascendi*): 'And now with our eyes fixed on the whole system, will anyone be surprised that we should define it as the synthesis of all heresies?'

At first sight such a judgment seems, from a Roman Catholic point of view, natural and inevitable. Revelation is truth formally expressed in definite words. Modernists (as the Pope understood them) would substitute, for it, subjectivism: at least, to a considerable degree. 'We have not to compare symbol with symbol, or theology with theology, or to show that one can be deduced from the other. We have to compare life with life; feeling with feeling; action with action;' (Father G. Tyrrell, *Christianity at the Crossroads;* 1909; p. 104). In Antonio Fogazzaro's *Il Santo,* again, 'there breathes the note of insistent and pitiless sincerity which will remind the formal tradition of dogma that it is only the imperfect depositary of the living tradition of holiness which is the Church's past: only the provisional, if necessary, instrument of its transmission to the future' (A. L. Lilley, Modernism; 1908; p. 131)

At first sight, then, it may seem but natural and inevitable that the Roman Church should condemn 'Modernism' and without mercy cast it from its fold. The Church stands for a definite revelation expressed in definite words; that type of Modernism which the Pope assailed tended rather to rely on evolutionary subjectivism; therefore the two conceptions are not compatible. 'Pius X infers that the Modernist system is a closely connected whole, and he defines it to be "the synthesis of all the heresies," concentrating into one evil theory their whole sap and substance, with the fatal result that many are the roads it opens leading to atheism and to the annihilation of all religion' (Addis and Arnold, *Catholic Dictionary;* 1917; p. 598).

The matter, however, is by no means so simple as this when we look more deeply into it. Modernists, of course, would challenge the accuracy of the Pope's conception of their position. Let us accept it, nevertheless, as representing Modernism as he saw it; and enquire, "Is Rome really so secure after all?"

What is ultimate truth? It is nothing but: *the actually existing reality of all that is*: God (whatever the word God may mean) and the entire universe of being — suns, planets, life, thought; all, in short, that is. Now, that totality of all that is must be either infinite or at least to us inconceivably immense. So far as we are concerned, however, the truth about it (to such extent as we can know the truth) has to be expressed in the feeble, finite language adapted to our very limited intelligence. That being so, it follows logically that such truth cannot be expressed even approximately adequately. The most perfect expression of it, of which our minds and words are capable, must be immensely far from accurately representing the infinite reality.

Indeed, Roman Catholic theology itself admits that fact. 'The existence,' says the *Catholic Encyclopaedia* (x, 662), 'of theological mysteries is a doctrine of the Catholic faith defined by the Vatican Council, which declares: "If anyone says that in Divine Revelation there are contained no mysteries properly so called . . . let him be anathema" '; and: "the mind of a creature cannot, indeed, grasp the inner nature of the mysterious truth, but it can express that truth by analogies."

No doubt it would be explained that by theological 'mysteries' is meant merely that there are some things which, by the very nature of our limited faculties, we cannot understand (*i.e.* infinity and eternity); but that nevertheless the Church's words about them are true so far as they go. Is such an explanation, however, sufficient? If the Church's dogmas are surrounded by — indeed, to a great extent even themselves partake of — mystery beyond comprehension, then probably that mystery contains elements which, if known, would make the dogmas seem very different from what commonly is understood. Who knows? — and, in any case, the very existence of the infinite mystery introduces the factor of incertitude.

We come face to face with such incertitude when we approach particular dogmas. That that of the Holy Trinity is an absolute mystery is not only not denied but also is positively affirmed. 'All Catholic theologians are agreed that the existence of the Trinity cannot be proved by reason, and although they add that the doctrine is above but not contrary to reason, still Billuart at least admits that we cannot prove "positively and evidently" that the doctrine does not involve a contradiction' (Addis and Arnold, *Catholic Dictionary,* p. 830). The doctrine of the Incarnation is almost equally (though in different ways) mysterious. 'What do you mean by the Incarnation? — I mean by the Incarnation that God the Son took to Himself the nature of man: "the Word was made Flesh" ' (Roman Catholic English *Catechism* qu. 40). Is it needful to mention, however, the innumerable theories (heretical and otherwise) which have been devised to make that mystery intelligible to our minds? 'Every part of the doctrine of the Incarnation has been contradicted by some class of heretics.' (Provost Wenham [R. C. theologian], *A Manual of Christian Doctrine;* 1905; p. 40). What is that fact, however, but a result of the further fact that the union of infinite Divinity with a finite human body and soul is a doctrine which cannot be expressed in language? Further, it is not merely *heretics* who have held differing views of it, whether in itself or in its relation to mankind. 'In the Latin Church the doctrine of Atonement does not appear to have been fixed (even so late as) in the eleventh century; at least if we may judge of it by the writings of Anselm. . . The Latin Church was far from having any consistent doctrine of Atonement' (J. Priestly, *Corruptions;* ed. 1871; pp. 82, 85). On the great subject of Grace, again, Roman Catholic theologians differ greatly. 'When we inquire into the nature of the distinction between efficacious and sufficient grace, Catholic theologians give different answers' (Addis and Arnold, *Catholic Dictionary,* 392). That is to put it very mildly! — for the truth of course is that this subject of Grace has caused disputes of vehement violence. That occasioned in the sixteenth century by Molina was but one of many; yet of it Mosheim (*Church History;* trans. Maclaine, 1827; ii, 65) could say truly: 'This alarm was followed by great commotions, and all things seemed to prognosticate a general flame.' The simple truth is, however, that predestination, election, free will, grace, etc., are matters essentially mysterious, and no words of ours can make them clear.

Then there is the doctrine of 'intention.' 'The Council of Trent (sess. vii *de Sact.,* canon 11) requires us to believe that the minister of the sacraments must have "the intention of doing that at least which the Church does." This definition has been the occasion of much controversy within and without the Church. Protestants have attacked it as making the effect of the Sacraments uncertain. Catholics have interpreted it variously' (Addis and Arnold 745-6). 'The majority of school theologians believe that secret withholding of the intention is enough to invalidate the sacrament. Our objection to this, the common theory, is grounded on the fact that its advocates can produce no proof from Scripture or tradition, while we fail to see the force of the argument from reason' (*Ibid.,* 747). Yet this problem, which is so full of uncertainty, affects the whole constitution of the Church: the ordinations of its clergy and the Sacraments they administer.

The doctrine of the Eucharist and the Real Presence brings us to further mysteries. In this article no attempt can be made to discuss those matters generally: nor is it needful for the present argument. One point alone will suffice.

The Council of Trent (sess. XIII, chapter 4) declared: 'And because that Christ our Redeemer declared that that which he offered under the species of bread is truly his own body, therefore has it been always a firm belief in the Church of God—and this sacred synod now does declare it anew — that, by the concentration of the bread and of the wine, a conversion is made of the whole substance of the bread into the substance of the body of Christ our Lord, and of the whole substance of the wine into the substance of his blood; which conversion is, by the Holy Catholic Church, suitably and properly called transubstantiation.' Amongst the canons annexed to that declaration were these (canon 1): 'If anyone shall say that in the sacrament of the most holy Eucharist are not contained truly, really, and substantially, the body and blood, together with the soul and divinity of our Lord Jesus Christ, and consequently Christ entire; but shall say that he is therein only as in a sign, or in figure, or by his power: let him be anathema'; and (canon 3): 'If anyone shall say that in the venerable sacrament of the Eucharist the entire Christ is not contained under each species, and under every separate particle of each species: let him be anathema.'

The main point with which we need deal here, in regard to the foregoing, is that it is 'of faith' that the entire *body* of Christ is in each Host and in every separate particle of each Host. This seems to imply that, as thousands of Masses are celebrated all over the world every day at one and the same time, there must be in existence at one and the same time thousands (? millions) of entire bodies of Christ! — yet the Church also maintains that Christ has but one body. Many endeavors have been made to escape this apparent absurdity. For example, the *Catholic Encyclopaedia* (V, 583) says: 'If divine omnipotence can in a supernatural manner impart to a body such a spiritual, unextended, spatially uncircumscribed mode of presence, which is natural to the soul as regards the human body, one may well surmise the possibility of Christ's Eucharistic Body being present in its entirety in the whole Host, and whole and entire in each part thereof.' Such an argument, however, seems beside the point. It confuses soul with body, and divests the word 'body' of all meaning. The fact is, the doctrine of transubstantiation not only is a mystery, but is so full of mystery as apparently to contravene the logical 'law of contradiction'; and in any case it cannot be presented clearly to the mind. The philosophical distinction of 'substance' and 'accidents' merely leaves the puzzle as before, since no clear meaning is given to the terms.

The doctrine of Papal Infallibility, again, is full of incertitude. According to the decree made by Pope Pius IX at the Vatican Council of 1870, 'it is a dogma divinely revealed that the Roman Pontiff — when he speaks *ex cathedra*: that is, when, in the exercise of his office of shepherd and teacher of all Christians, by his supreme apostolic authority he defines a doctrine concerning faith or morals as needing to be held by the universal Church — through the divine assistance promised to him in blessed Peter, possesses that infallibility which our divine Redeemer willed his Church to have in defining doctrine of faith or morals.'

The difficulty is, however: What Papal utterances are to be reckoned as *ex cathedra?* Theologians disagree on that vital point. In 1907 Pope Pius X defined Modernism to be the synthesis of all heresies. Was that definition *ex cathedra?* Leo XIII, in various encyclicals, condemned the principles of liberty of conscience, separation of Church and State, etc. Were those utterances *ex cathedra?* As Dr. C. J. Cadoux (*Catholicism and Christianity;* 1928; p. 30) said: 'It is unreasonable in simple logic to separate off some public and official utterances of the Pope as *ex cathedra*, from other public and official utterances which are couched in equally authoritative language and equally assume the right to settle points of faith and morals.'

We come to this, then: *Behind the apparently solid unity and certitude of Roman Catholic belief is really a mass of incertitude not only as to the real meaning of abstract theological dogmas, but also as to the nature of the teaching authority of the Church and as to how many publicly-taught doctrines actually are binding on the faithful.*

Nearly forty years ago a little book was published in England which analyzed in masterly detail this matter of the uncertainty of much Roman Catholic teaching. The Rev. J. Duggan was Roman Catholic priest at Maidstone, Kent. He was a man of learning and deeply religious spirit. In 1897 he published, through Messrs. Kegan Paul, a book entitled *Steps Towards Reunion*. Its argument was that the authorities of the Roman Catholic Church are imposing on their people, both in doctrine and in discipline, burdens not justified by the authority of that Church itself. 'On doctrine can we surrender anything? I show that,' he said (p. 4), 'contrary to what is commonly said by Catholics, we can surrender a vast body of doctrine. We can surrender all that is taught not *by* the Church but *in* the Church *by theologians*.' Developing that thesis, he showed that immense quantities of current teaching amongst Roman Catholics is sanctioned by no definite irreversible decree of the Church, but is merely matter of theological opinion.

Father Duggan's book was placed on the Index: where it still remains. Mere placing of a book thereon, however, does not necessarily mean that its contents are false. It *may* mean that; but it may mean only that the issue of the book is inexpedient. In a privately-printed pamphlet, *The Proposed Sale of Maidstone Presbytery*, published in 1898 (a copy is in the British Museum Library: press-mark, 3940 i 13, 2), Father Duggan made it clear that he had not abandoned the ideas of his book. He died in full communion with the Roman Church.

The truth is that there was much in his contentions which was beyond denial. Theoretically, Roman Catholicism *can* abandon an immense deal: *not only of discipline but also of doctrine*. The reason she does not do so is — conservatism. As we have seen in this article however, she really possesses much less certitude than seems at first sight to be hers. Amongst the things her conservatism retains are many that are clearly erroneous even on comparatively 'orthodox' religious assumptions. Her present rigid retention of them drives from her fold many — the present writer is one — who would have loved to remain in it.

If Rome were really the uniquely-guided organ of divine truth, the true balance would be preserved, and the maintenance of rigid worldly obscurantism would be needless. As it is, it seems as though such maintenance will continue until a dramatic collapse occurs again as it did in the sixteenth century. That is the perennial tragedy of ecclesiastical rigidity.

THE NEW CHRISTENDOM

Theodore C. Vermilye, in the Orate Fratres for January, wrote a tribute to Father Virgil Michael and to his efforts in the direction of Christian Unity. Father Michael, who recently died, had paid a trip to Nova Scotia last winter, and had become an ardent supporter of the Christian co-operatives.

Mr. Vermilye states that Virgil Michael had made his own the words of Abbé Couturier, the great French apostle of Unity, who wrote:

"It is a fact that Christians are separated; it is another fact that they long for unity. . . . Disruption is grievious and the signs of rapprochement are consoling. But all we separated Christians must suffer deeply from the sadness of disunion. . . . The history of the past has shown Christians their powerlessness to preserve unity or to reestablish it. . . . What man has destroyed, man cannot rebuild. . . . It is enough for man that he should offer himself to the divine influence, to the breath of the Spirit of God . . . . When reunion has become an accomplished fact, what will the body of Christ be like?. . . . It is certain that the Body of Christ will be different from that which each and every Christian group has been hitherto. The divine spirit of brotherhood will breathe without let or hindrance."

From the St. Francis-Xavier University EXTENSION BULLETIN.

PIUS *XI*

By J. A. MacCALLUM

—*"Catholic action comes perilously near to becoming a common nuisance."*

WHILE IT IS true, as Southey said, that "fame has no present and popularity no future," it is a reasonable forecast that the late Pope, Pius XI, won for himself a recognized place in the history of his time. Within the limits permitted by an inflexible frame of reference, he was a scholar. In a system that tends to produce men of iron will, he had a will of steel. His physical strength and fortitude were proved by his resolution as a mountain climber, while parallel psychical qualities were evidenced in the firmness with which he stood against the encroachments of Hitler upon the province of the Church and the brazen arrogance of Mussolini, in his bombastic dogmatism upon Jewish racial inferiority.

Pius XI was also progressive in his recognition that applied science adds to the comfort and efficiency of living. The modernization of the Vatican by the installation of the telegraph, telephone, and the radio, together with contemporary library equipment, with the need of which he was familiar as a librarian, indicates initiative and some realization that the present is not to be altogether ignored in its possible contribution to the technique of current living. Probably his greatest claim for fame will lie in the concordat he established with Mussolini through which the long fiction of papal imprisonment in Vatican City dissolved.

We reach more dubious ground when we seek to appraise Catholic Action, to which he gave such ardent support and which he affirmed was "the apple of his eye." Theoretically the idea is excellent, that Christians should enlist as eager crusaders for righteousness under the banner of the Lord. The trouble is that the ecclesiastical conception of righteousness is often in conflict with the view held by others. When Monsignor Corrigan, of the Catholic University of Washington, talks of putting God into the government, Protestants have reason to suspect that God is a synonym for the Church. Moreover, the ardent crusader requires a poise and a wisdom that are not evident in the average man unless he is subjected to a protracted period of discipline. Unfortunately for the future of Catholic Action in this country, many of those

Editorial in PRESBYTERIAN TRIBUNE, *March 2, 1939* who represent the Church have neither the wisdom nor the training to justify their program to the community. True, thus far they have been singularly successful but unless all signs are deceptive, a reaction is not far around the corner. Protestants and non-Catholics generally are becoming increasingly annoyed by the strenuous zeal of their militant neighbors and their interference as a minority with the rights and mores of the majority. The influence of the Roman Church is evident in its control of the movies, in which the Catholic priest always plays the noble part, while the Protestant cleric is usually a simpleton or a mountebank. Its control of the press has been of long standing but has of late been tightened by Catholic action.

Furthermore, Catholic Action comes perilously near to becoming a common nuisance. Let a lecture on fascism, anti-Semitism, or civil liberties be announced in any community where Catholicism is strong and an organized group is sure to be present to heckle the speakers and distribute anonymous red-baiting pamphlets. The spokesmen for Catholic Action make extravagant claims about the Church's mission and success in combating communism, in some instances going as far as to maintain that it has saved the United States from this Marxian menace. The truth is that communism and Catholicism are closely related. Their conflict has every aspect of a blood feud. They are both totalitarian in genius. No more fantastic joke was ever attempted upon an unsophisticated community than the voluble championship of democracy by the Church of Rome. The record of Pius XI indicates that there has been little or no modification of the traditional policy. It is not prejudice but awareness of reality that prompts us to declare that Freedom would have cause to shriek more loudly than "when Kosciusko fell," if Rome could secure control of the government of the United States. While there are some evidences of increasing liberality and therefore some hope of an evolution to a level where Rome will cooperate with other churches, the outlook on the whole is far from encouraging.

If this seems a harsh or uncompromising appraisal of a man who was a gifted leader with many excellent qualities, in our defense we have only to cite the papal attitude toward the Spanish loyalists. Insofar as the rebellion was Spanish in origin, it was fostered by the Church and the army. Nor was this all. The leaders called in alien aid, without which they could never have succeeded. The pontifical blessing was freely given to these implacable enemies of freedom. When every extenuating factor is admitted, Pius XI was still the exponent of the same Church from whose repressive grip Calvin, Luther, and Knox freed our forefathers. Essentially the pattern of his thought was of a piece with that of his predecessor. In giving his benediction to Franco, he revealed the opportunism which always characterizes the policy of the Church. In effect this was an alliance with Hitler, an uncompromising enemy of Christianity, and with Mussolini, for whose rapacious conduct in Ethiopia he had already found grounds for justification.

If Protestants are half awake they will not be misled by the vociferous praises of democracy by the spokesmen of the Roman Church in this country. It is essentially fascist in its genius and needs only the opportunity to display its real character. Its democratic claims in the United States are nothing more than protective coloration. In Quebec, where it has free play, the hierarchy is the fountain of inspiration for the establishment of a fascist regime. The hostility of the French Canadians to the western democracies is due entirely to the teachings of the Church. Official Catholic opinion supports Japan in its rape of China because Japan is a part of the anti-communist axis, and communism is the bogey by which opinion is lured to the support of Roman Catholic power politics. While there are many liberal supporters of democracy in the Church, they do not control its action and are continually embarrassed by the papal policies.

The time is ripe for the only answer that an authoritarian church can understand. Fissiparous Protestantism must find a way to coordinate its powers and escape from the impasse and impotency caused by its varied voices. *Divide and rule* is still the strategy of the totalitarian. Protestantism must unite for action. Fortunately the increasing boldness of Rome is the greatest asset of its critics. The sleeping giant is gradually being roused from his stupor and when he becomes conscious of his powers, he will make a quick end to the damage he has allowed his small but vigorous neighbor to work upon him. Protestant Action alone will effect the abrogation of the favored position in the newspapers and on the films, an estoppel on the preponderance of public jobs which go to Roman Catholics, and a sustained and vigorous answer to their propaganda. Protestants must awake.

The tendency of Catholicism lies in the direction of ecclesiastical totalitarianism. If this is unchecked, the outcome is sure to favor the advance of totalitarianism in general.

NO OBLIGATION

CHAMBERLAIN ON OCTOBER 6TH:

To accuse us of having. . . . betrayed the Czechoslovakian State is simply preposterous. What we did was to save her from annihilation and give her a chance of new life as a new State, which involves the loss of territory and fortifications but may perhaps enable her to enjoy in the future and develop a national existence under a neutrality and security comparable to that which we see in Switzerland to-day.

NO OBLIGATION

"It will be generally agreed that there is no . . . obligation upon the British Government to take any direct action in the present developments in Central Europe."—*Times,* March 14.

CZECHOSLOVAKIA meets her fate
Disarmed, enslaved and carved in three.
Though Britain guaranteed the State
No State exacts a guarantee
When it has ceased to be.

Through Munich, Prague, and yet beyond
Appeasement's path must be pursued;
Democracy need not despond
While Britain's word is still as good
As Hitler's bond.

Though tolerant in deed and word
Of Powers that murder, cheat and lie,
Our hands are clean, our purpose high,
And through the world our voice is heard—
Live and let die!

SAGITTARIUS

In the NEW STATESMAN AND NATION

PIUS XII AND THE AXIS

By G. A. BORGESE

—"The very idea of such a compromise (between the Roman Church and democratic or liberal civilization) has been stifled irretrievably by the Church as anathema."

I

IN THE near future Pope Pius XII will face, in an atmosphere of dire difficulties, the consequences of the policy of his predecessor. This policy was largely his own. As a church diplomat and as Secretary of State, Eugenio Pacelli specialized in papal relations with Germany and Italy; he led the church to unavoidable retreat and submission under the Fascist threat in 1931, and two years later, that bitter failure notwithstanding, he negotiated an unfortunate concordat with Nazism. The Catholic party in Germany, intentionally democratic or at least anti-totalitarian, was surrendered to Hitler — an error, or a destiny, which Don Sturzo's Popular Catholic Party had experienced in Italy several years before. The events of these last years have obviously convinced the Vatican that a Catholic alliance with the pagan axis is an alliance of lamb and wolf. How and with what results the new Pope may alter the course which the church chose under his predecessor's leadership is a question so gigantic as to discourage any prophet.

In a more or less remote future the strife between the church and the totalitarian states will prove to be an issue involving the relations — theological as well as political — between the Roman church and democracy or liberalism, in other terms, between Catholicism and Protestantism, the latter being unmistakably the background of modern liberal thought. The same is true of the relations between the Italian nation and the papacy.

Many Italians in past centuries have thought and many more think nowadays that the Italians are the people elect, and that it is their task to rule the world through the combined forces of a Roman emperor and a Roman pontiff. It is, however, questionable whether the Catholic world at large would be amenable in the long run to such a theory. The record speed at which the cardinals agreed on electing Pacelli indicates only how alarmed they were by the problems of a more remote future, how eager to postpone them as long as possible, how contented at last with the dilatory expediency of prolonging the pontificate of Pius

From the NATION, *March 11, 1939*

XI, with all its responsibilities, in the person of Pius XI's closest associate and adviser. Considered from a certain angle this election compares with the vote of confidence bestowed by a parliament on a shaky cabinet whose succession no opposition covets.

But non-Italian candidacies, especially that of the French Canadian Villeneuve, loomed large in the conclave, and the problem of the relations between a strong, national Italy on the one side and a Christian and universal church on the other is now open and can hardly be expected to be solved before many years of struggle and crisis. There is a curious suggestion in the famous prophecy of Saint Malachy, according to which the pope who will succeed Pius XII will be *pastor et nauta,* pastor and sailor. Yet this virtual and already present contrast between Italy as a world power and the church as universality is only one aspect, and a rather superficial one, of the trials which the Roman Catholic church will face in the decades to come.

II

The history and the essence of Roman Catholicism are only understandable if one takes into account the three major defeats which it has suffered in the course of the Christian era, none of which have so far been retrieved. First the Roman church lost the loyalty and obedience of all Eastern Europe. While this rift was enlarging into the Oriental schism, it lost to Mohammedanism all northern Africa plus Asia Minor, Syria, and all the Near East that had been a constituent part of the Roman Empire, of the ancient unity. Finally at the close of the Renaissance the north of Europe became largely Protestant, separating itself from Rome. As a consequence of the latter heresy or separation—until transatlantic countries were able to make up at least partly for the loss—the Roman Catholic church receded to approximately the boundaries that had been those of the western, European part of the Roman Empire.

How the church reacted to these repeated and disastrous defeats is well known. Each time the organism tightened its defensive apparatus; it adopted the technique and the strict discipline of a beleaguered fortress; it enforced an increasingly more absolute obedience while formulating its dogmas with more and more compulsory exactitude. The most famous episode of these tactics of defense, whose purpose was to start again a conquering march on the world whenever it might seem possible, was the Council of Trent immediately after the outbreak of Luther's and Calvin's rebellion.

What happened in the nineteenth century is less familiar to the average cultured mind, especially in Protestant or agnostic countries like the United States, not only because recent events are less easily synthesized, but also because the struggle, which included so much of the contemporary history of these years, happened to be fought almost exclusively on Italian soil over Italian issues which seemed to almost everybody to have only local and temporary significance. Now, however, everybody's attention should be directed to the enormous meaning of the events that took place in Italy and within the Catholic church during the pontificate of Pius IX, from 1846 to 1878. That was the beginning of what should be called, and most probably will be called some day, the second Counter-Reformation, and that was the crisis and the struggle in which were sown many of the seeds which later fructified in Fascism, Nazism, Munich, and after-Munich as far as we can contemplate.

III

At the start of his reign Pius IX believed for a short time in a possible conciliation of Catholicism with liberalism and of the universal church with Italian national feeling. For a few months he was hailed as the leader of the Italian national *risorgimento*. The outcome was irreparable discord between the Pope and the administration of the liberalized Papal State, the Pope's flight and exile, the foundation of the short-lived Roman Republic under the inspiration of Mazzini, the intervention of the French troops, and the return of the ousted Pope, now utterly sobered as to the unnatural and unhistorical alliances which he had envisioned. The interval between the return of Pius IX to Rome and the complete unification of Italy, with the military occupation of Rome by the Piedmontese army and the self-imprisonment of the Curia in the Vatican palaces, was comparatively a very short one—twenty years, from 1850 to 1870. But it was sufficient to start and organize a series of events which now appears to be the most important heritage handed down by the nineteenth century.

The papacy had become aware that the rational, liberal, scientific trends of European philosophy and politics of that age held for the Catholic church even greater dangers than were contained in the challenge of the Protestant sects three centuries earlier. The defense was magnificently adequate, although at first it seemed to consist of mere words, lacking all power. The church of the sixteenth century had defied the Protestant Reformation with the Council of Trent and the so-called Counter-Reformation; the second Counter-Reformation was started by Pius IX and found expression in two documents—or deeds—which Catholics and non-Catholics alike should know very exactly but which practically nobody at present cares to consult when problems arise concerning the relations between democracy and the church.

These two documents are the "Syllabus of Errors," published in 1864, and the Dogmatic Decrees of the Vatican Council, promulgated in 1870, only a few short weeks before the Italian annexation of the Papal States. Many will remember these dates and titles. But what counts is whether the spirit and words of the documents are present, as they should be, to political and religious minds. It is unquestionable that both the decisions of the council of 1870 and the "Syllabus of Errors" have dogmatic validity. No hierarch, no doctor of the Catholic church, qualifies the obedience that is due to each and all of the teachings and prescriptions of the two documents.

Popularly stated, the gist of the decisions of the council of 1870 is the infallibility of the Pope. It was a compensation for the loss of temporal power, the acquisition of *an indisputable and boundless autocratic majesty in the spiritual world as opposed to the impious and possibly temporary triumphs of Protestant liberalism on earth. The One directly inspired by God hovered over the chaos of the many.*

The "Syllabus," for its part, listed the errors of modern times which the church refused forever to countenance. It is an error, among seventy-nine others, that "the church ought to tolerate the errors of philosophy, leaving to philosophy the care of their corrections." It is an error that "every man is free to embrace and profess the religion he shall believe true, guided by the light of reason." It is an error that "men may in any religion find the way of eternal salvation, and obtain eternal salvation." It is an error that "we may entertain at least a well-founded hope for the eternal salvation of all those who are in no manner in the true Church of Christ." It is an error that "Protestantism is nothing more than another form of the same true Christian religion." It is an error that "it appertains to the civil power to define what are the rights and limits with which the church may exercise authority." It is an error that "the church has not the power of availing herself of force, or any direct or indirect temporal power." All the eighty sentences should be learned and memorized by Catholics and non-Catholics alike. But certainly the last is comprehensive enough to give in a few solemn, powerful words the total intention and meaning of the document. It states in unsophisticated Latin as heavy as a tombstone that it is an error to believe that *"Romanus Pontifex potest ac debet cum progressu, cum liberalismo, et cum recenti civilitate sese reconciliare et componere."* The Pope and modern civilization are proclaimed utterly irreconcilable.

IV

Now it is theoretically and, who knows, perhaps even actually possible that what we call modern civilization, the development of human thought from the Renaissance to the eve of the World War, is doomed and rotten. It is possible that we are at the end of an age and that something new is growing under our tottering steps. It can not even be excluded theoretically that this something new is something old, miraculously revived, made of one heart and one piece, triumphantly aggressive, the church of the Middle Ages, perfected through ordeal and defeat in the final statutes of the despoiled Pontiff Pius IX and his successors. The Encyclical "Pascendi," by which Pius X crushed the resurgent errors of theological modernism, is one of many events in line with the fundamental documents of the second Counter-Reformation. The pontificate of Pius XI seems to have brought the first fruits of revindication. Until a few years ago the church was regularly on the losing side. Under the pontificate of Pius XI it has reconquered at least Italy and Spain, it has spread its influence deep and far in the Western Hemisphere, it has even regained temporal power in Vatican City, ceded to the Papacy by Fascist Italy in the Lateran Treaty of 1929. This is, to be sure, a tiny territory, but it has a very great significance, since it is the intention of the token that counts and not the number of acres or the weight of the bricks.

We have become accustomed to such changes that nothing can now surprise anybody living in this age. Fascism and Nazism would have seemed thoroughly unthinkable twenty years ago, and a prophet of such events as we read about every morning would have seemed fit for a sanatorium. Therefore nothing logically or historically compulsory can be formulated against the hypothesis that the Roman Catholic church, self-defined as the "perfect society," may conquer the entire world. This may happen or not. One thing, however, is certain, even if only one, and that is that a reconciliation between the Roman church and modern civilization—that is, democratic or liberal civilization in the meaning that we give to these words—is utterly impossible and that the very idea of such a compromise has been stifled irretrievably by the church as anathema.

If by democracy one means the belief that all human souls have equal dignity before God, and that each and every human soul, provided that it accepts the rule of salvation as imparted by the Roman church, may attain eternal bliss, then the Catholic church is a perfect democracy. The firmness of its insistence on the inborn and transcendental equality of all men before the judgment of God constitutes one of those most vital and glorious Christian elements which are permanent in the Catholic church and which make it impossible for even the ugliest and most vulgar anti-clericalism to treat Catholicism as a phenomenon of depravity comparable to such un-Christian and inhuman monstrosities as Fascism and Nazism. But if by democracy, or even, more exactly, by liberalism, one means, the right of everybody to think and think freely and to bring his own contribution to the progress of collective human life and to the advancement of knowledge—the concession of equal rights and equal dignity to all religious beliefs—then the talk that we hear so often and so insistently in these days about the Roman Church as a mainstay of liberalism, tolerance, and democracy is frivolous, futile, and dangerous, for there is always danger in obscurity and confusion of issues.

As regards the particular relations at the present moment between Roman Catholicism and the totalitarian states in Europe, there cannot remain a decent doubt that the anti-Christian trends of such states, veiled more or less by cleverness and circumstances in Italy, blunt and outrageous in Germany, must displease the Roman church. But such strife between the ecclesiastical and the civil authorities is as old at least as European Christian society, and it may be a delusion to think that even the fight between the church and Hitler is at bottom more substantial than the quarrel between the German emperors of the Middle Ages, such as Frederic Barbarossa, and the Latin popes—unless the fundamental issues, theological as well as political, involved in the relations between Catholicism and liberalism are faced sooner or later by a renovated church. On the other hand it should be quite clear that if the perfect society as represented by the church is embodied in an organism autocratically ruled, the tendency of the church must be to favor the legislative order which is forced on nations by strictly monarchical institutions, and the Catholic mind at large must feel, at least for reasons of analogy, more sympathetic to organisms like Italy and Germany than to democracies swept hither and yon by the emotions and the interests of the changing masses.

With respect to the United States, there seems to be no doubt about the historical correctness of William Haller's study of "The Puritan Background of the First Amendment." "What the founders of the national union did or did not do about religion was of the utmost significance for the success of their enterprise. The assumptions concerning truth and human nature underlying the doctrine of religious liberty—namely,. that *truth is most surely discovered when everybody is free to take part in the search of truth* [italics mine] and that it is at least equally as important for every man to think and speak as for some to think correctly and to speak wisely—these notions now seem to most Americans axiomatic." To most Americans, but not to all? Are the Catholics taken as a body among the "most," or are they not?

V

This is an issue intrinsic to the development of American Catholicism and to the problems that American Catholics must inevitably face in the near future. The *modus vivendi* seems quite plain, and theoretically it is. In several ways the attention of an increasingly large and increasingly alarmed group has been called to the tendency of many individual Catholics and Catholic organizations in this country to acquire a larger share of power than is due proportionately to them, and to hamper through pressure or other devious ways the effectiveness of those very principles of free speech and free thought and free worship to which they owe their prosperity and power in the United States. It ought to be plain that a permanent *modus vivendi,* equally necessary for Catholics and non-Catholics in America, would consist in the liberty of Catholics to be Catholic and in their acknowledgement that all other beliefs or disbeliefs have an equal share in American freedom, which share should not even be curtailed by such invisible but actually oppressive means as pressure, censorship, and boycott.

But clearly enough such an attitude would imply a very substantial concession on the part of Catholics to the spirit of liberalism and democracy and would be virtually and actually in disagreement with the teachings of the "syllabus" and the decisions of the council of 1870, which point unmistakably to the hierocratic system of the Roman church. This aims beyond all renouncement and defeat at a perfect society in which the Pope should be, if not personally the absolute emperor, at least the inspirer and watchman and judge of those who rule the earth.

Whether this immanent contrast between the spirit of Americanism and the system of Catholicism as it has been shaped by history can be evaded by American Catholics or whether the inner split is bound to develop some day into an open crisis is a problem that must be left to Catholics themselves, at least for the time being. But contemplation of history from observatories not befogged by crude and mean passions opens a vista, even if a dim one, into the coming age. It is quite likely that much of this century of ours will be an age of religious upheaval and readjustment, that it will attempt to shape beliefs acceptable to reason and science and liberty, while treating the religious heritage of the past no less likely and devotedly than early and later Christianity treated the Jewish prophetic tradition.

IF THIS BE CHRISTIANITY

In his Madras Conference address Anglican Bishop Azariah of India reported a leading Hindu's comment when Italian troops received the Pope's blessing on their return from the conquest of Ethiopia. "If this be Christianity," said the Hindu, "I want none of it."

—*From* Missions, *March, 1939.*

VOICES OF HATE

By JOHN VAN SCHAICK, JR.

—"We must do something more than denounce."

Churches can render timely service to our country just now by combating bravely and intelligently the menace of fascism. It is the great menace. Why not bracket with this menace the menace of communism? Because in our judgment communism is a trifling, inconsequential menace, if menace at all it be. The illustrated weekly *Life* recently put the matter this way: "There is one profound difference which makes fascism a far graver menace to America than communism. For communism is a frank proposal to change America's whole way of life by taking away every man's possessions and giving them to the state. With this alien ideal, the Communist Party in America has in twenty years acquired 100,000 active members and some 129,900,000 enemies. But fascism begins as a call to fearful men to unite to defend against clutching enemies not only their country but also their personal possessions. Americans in the past have responded in multitudes to that call. In fear-ridden 1939 it now appears that an increasing number of them are yielding again."

Some seventeen thousand friends of the German-American Bund (American fascists), assembled in New York for a pro-American rally in honor of Washington's birthday, denounced our democracy and the President, praised Hitler, linked the Jews with communism and demanded that they be thrown out of the country.

Life, in its issue of March 6, publishes two pages of pictures which produce the cover pages of some of the literature now being circulated in our country.

On the cover of Father Coughlin's *Social Justice,* which has a million subscribers it is said, is a noble-looking Hitler. In the paper is an article reviewing a work, long ago exposed as a forgery, called "The Protocols of the Elders of Zion," and claiming that it is factual whether genuine or not. These forged protocols show a Jewish conspiracy to seize control of the world. *Liberation,* the organ of the Silver Shirts, tells its readers to get ready for a civil war to overthrow the Jewish hierarchy that has seized our government.

Editorial in THE CHRISTIAN LEADER, *March 18, 1939*

An organ of the American National Socialist Party, with a swastika at the masthead, tells how masses of Jews are swarming to America to take away its readers' jobs. So with nine other fascist publications. All preach hatred of the Jews. A major-general of the army, on retirement, it is alleged, made a speech "in which he warned publicly of a patriotic uprising 'which will make the massacres now recorded in history look like peaceful church parades.'" Ten men are pictured by *Life* as being "Voices of Hate."

It would be a foolish individual who would deny the existence of such voices of hate. And we are inclined to think that many of us have underestimated the influence which they are exerting. We have to reckon with the power of the radio as well as the power of meetings and literature. Voices of hate just now are exerting a dangerous influence. Most of them are utterly unscrupulous. In some instances they are the voices of men who believe they can reproduce the careers of Hitler, Mussolini and other fascist leaders.

The churches should remember that there is power also in voices of love. Those voices should be speaking in clearer tones, with larger intelligence and deeper spiritual appeal. We must not fight fire with fire, but overcome evil with good. We never can do it if we do not know what it is all about, and we never can do it if we do not much care.

We must be thoughtful, calm, but in dead earnest. We must do something more, and other, than denounce. Our ideal must be to become one of the voices of love. It is not easy, but the reward is great. Love when real is mighty. A great Jew even declared once: "Love never fails."

The Christendom that is in Babel striveth about the manner how men ought to serve God and glorify Him; also, how they are to know Him, and what He is in His Essence and Will. And they preach positively that whatsoever is not one and the same with them in every particular of knowledge and opinion, is no Christian, but a heretic. —Jacob Boehme.

TORTURE SQUADS FOR U. S.

By D. BOORSTIN, G. MAYBERRY, J. RACKLIFFE

—"The Jew — whipping-boy, red herring and scape-goat"

IMAGINE an American schoolroom five years from now. An American flag stands in one corner. A class in science is being held, and suddenly the teacher calls a Jewish child to the front of the room. The child is fair-skinned. Her grandparents and great-grandparents were born in this country. Her father fought in the World War. But the teacher, under orders she dares not disobey, takes a book on race theory and reads to the class. This child, she says, is impure, un-American, unworthy to associate with the other children. There are giggles and jeers from some of the pupils who have heard words of hatred spoken against the Jews in their homes. The sobbing child tries to run away, but the teacher keeps her there while she compares her and her parents to savages, to unclean beasts, to monkeys in the jungle. Then she sends the child from the school telling her she can never return.

Imagine a Catholic Church in America five years from now. It is Sunday, and while the mass is being said stones crash through the stained-glass windows. The people cower, while uniformed troopers march down the aisles, kicking aside the panic-stricken men and women. They go straight to the altar, seize the priest. With jeers and blows they drive him down through the hushed worshippers, who know that he will never return from the concentration camp to which he is being taken.

Imagine the home of a college professor late some night five years from now. He is on the troopers' list of those who have dared to speak out against the persecution of the Jews, and they have come for him, breaking down the door, marching to the bedroom, seizing him and his wife. The wife is pushed out of the car as they come into the city, and is set to cleaning latrines with a group of Jewish women. The husband is taken to headquarters, to be turned over to the sadists of the torture squad. We do not want to believe that these things could happen under the American flag. But thousands of people are now barred from employment in many places because they happen to be Jews. Negroes have been horribly

From the pamphlet ANTI-SEMITISM *published by Rev. Theodore DeLuca, Wakefield, Mass.*

tortured, mutilated, and burned alive under that flag. Helpless strikers have been gassed and shot and beaten to death under that flag. Can we forget Centralia, Gallup, Camp Hill, the Imperial Valley, Jersey City, Chicago on Memorial Day, 1937?

We firmly believe that the conscience of America, once it is aroused, must and will eliminate these outrages against democracy. We firmly believe that the conscience of America, once it is aroused, will refuse to allow the germs of anti-Semitism to develop into the Black Plague of Fascism. But to arouse our country's conscience—this is our task, the task of all those who truly love America and American democracy.

The Threat to Liberty

Recently a prominent Jewish comedian, back from Europe, spoke at a meeting of people concerned with the refugee problem. He told of having dinner in London with a man who had just been released from a concentration camp in Germany. That night the comedian could not sleep. His mind returned again and again to the fiendish tortures he had heard described by one who had seen them and suffered them.

Two weeks later the speaker was on the deck of a ship approaching New York. "When I saw the Statue of Liberty," he said, "I actually broke down and cried like a kid. We people in America don't half appreciate the freedom this country gives us."

In this statement the comedian was half right and half wrong. He was right when he said Americans don't half appreciate the principles of liberty and democracy written into the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution of the United States. But he was wrong in thinking that once he was past the Statue of Liberty he had left race prejudice and the threat of Fascism behind him. . . . What did the comedian think when he heard Father Coughlin's radio speech of November 20? Did he sleep peacefully that night? What does he think when he sees the anti-Semitic writings issued by more than eight hundred groups in the United States?

Can any of us, Gentiles or Jews, sleep peacefully after hearing one of Father Coughlin's tirades? We dream of the stake and the torture chambers of the Middle Ages. We hear the Czarist Black Hundreds riding down on villages in the night, murdering, raping, braining infants against the sides of buildings. We see prisoners in the concentration camps of Germany forced to clean floors with their tongues amid the jeers and kicks of selected guards. We awake with a start of terror.

Can we, waking, rejoice that we are in the United States? We can! But we know that the poison that helped to destroy Germany is being absorbed bit by bit in the veins of our own country. After we have heard one of Father Coughlin's speeches, or read the vicious lies being turned out by hundreds of printing presses, we walk the streets with less confidence that the United States, just because it is the United States, is safe from the race hatreds and Fascist tyrannies of Europe. Our country doesn't "give" us liberty; we have to pay for it, and the price is action, organized, courageous, democratic action against those forces who would take liberty from us. It is not a time for retreat but for advance. No one can afford to wait or to be silent.

We don't want pogroms in America. We don't want Fascism in America. And we won't have them. But we have a fight on our hands. We face attacks on Jews, on liberals, on Catholics, on Protestants, on democracy itself. They never come alone. One always leads to another.

What is the history of anti-Semitism? What causes anti-Semitic feeling? What kind of people are responsible for it? What are Father Coughlin's motives? Does he tell the truth? Does he represent the opinion of the Catholic Church? How can we solve the problem of anti-Semitism? These are some of the questions we can no longer postpone but must answer immediately and honestly.

The Story of Anti-Semitism

There is a tribe of savages in Africa that does not understand the causes of disease. When there is a plague, these people do not look for germs or try to improve sanitation. They pick out some one unfortunate man or woman, usually one who looks different from the others, who has different colored hair, or a funny nose, or is deformed in some way. They take the victim to the place where they believe God to be. They torture and finally kill him, and throw his body out of the land. This ceremony has gone on for years, but disease continues to visit the tribe.

The story of anti-Semitism is very much like the story of these savages. Indeed, in the Middle Ages, when a great plague swept over Europe, the cry went up, "Get rid of the Black Death by killing the Jews!"

Today, nobody in Europe or America thinks of blaming epidemics on the Jews, but we have other evils that are as little understood as plagues were six hundred years ago. Modern society suffers from economic depressions, low wages, poverty, and unemployment, and many people, instead of studying these problems scientifically, blame them on individuals and groups, especially on the Jews.

In some ways the situation in so-called civilized society is worse than among the savage tribe of Africa, for among the savages only ignorance is to be blamed. In our society, on the other hand, ignorance is deliberately encouraged. Farmers, factory workers, clerks, professional men, owners of small businesses—all these people face unemployment, low incomes, insecurity. If they could face their common problems clearly, no doubt mutually helpful solutions could be found. But there are those who for selfish reasons oppose such cooperation. They try to spread confusion and division, and find anti-Semitism one of the best ways of doing this.

Throughout history, the powers-that-be have utilized the instrument of anti-Semitism to make of the Jew their convenient scape-goat. Especially in times of distress, the anger of the non-Jewish peasant, artisan and worker was directed against the Jews. The Jews have thus been used as the whipping-boy through the ages.

Forms of anti-Semitism have existed for a long time. In the Middle Ages there were laws that virtually forced many Jews to act as money-lenders. Jews were not permitted to buy or own land and become farmers. Jews were not permitted to enter government service or the armies of the countries in which they lived. Jews were not permitted to go into industry. With all means of livelihood denied to them, except commerce and trade, the result was that many Jews became traders and small-business people and some of the more successful, bankers, financiers, and usurers.

Thus the "business instinct" for which many Jews are now condemned, was something imposed upon them by those who condemned them.

Furthermore, the Princes and Emperors took from the Jews what the Jews took from the people. Thus the rulers got the money, and the Jews got the blame.

In modern times, with depressions every seven or eight years, anti-Semitism has been more highly organized. After the Franco-Prussian

War in 1870, Germany had a short boom and then a bad depression. The people were getting ready to do something about the situation, and it was necessary to stop them. Suddenly a man appeared who was able to mislead large numbers of people and keep them from accomplishing anything. His name was Adolf Stoecker, a Court preacher, and he founded the "Christian Social Labor Party." He told the aristocrats and conservatives that the Jews were radicals; he told the nationalists that the Jews believed in internationalism; he told the employers that the Jews were organizing labor; and he told the workers that the Jews were greedy capitalists.

That is the way anti-Semitism works. In France, at this same time, it was used by monarchists and other enemies of democracy. In the famous Dreyfus case high officers in the French army accused Captain Alfred Dreyfus, a Jew, of treason, and they used forgery and perjury to conceal facts that proved his innocence. Believers in truth and democracy, like Emile Zola, backed by the French workers and the Socialist Party of France, courageously brought the ugly facts out into the open, and fought the case to a successful conclusion. The anti-Semitic plotters were exposed and discredited.

The worst situation before the World War was in Russia, where the government deliberately encouraged and co-operated in pogroms, and where every pogrom was followed by more and more repressive laws. Outstanding dignitaries of the Catholic Church, such as the Bishop in Warsaw, protested, as did Cardinal Manning, but the outrages continued. After 1900, as the labor movement grew stronger, anti-Semitism was used in an attempt to divide the working class. Anti-Semitic bands, called the "Black Hundreds" sprang up under the government protection, and in 1905 there were 690 pogroms in six days. So shocked were the people of the United States that Congress unanimously adopted a resolution expressing its concern and sympathy.

Anti-Semitism existed, then, long before Nazism. It was taken up by the Nazis and Fascists, who use all the reactionary tricks that have been developed through the ages. Hitler, however, was not satisfied with equalling his predecessors in cruelty; he has surpassed them in lying slander. Using his terrorized professors, he has tried to strengthen anti-Semitism by nonsense about racial purity and the part played by various "races" in history. The racial teachings of the Nazis have been exposed again and again by the highest scientific authorities, just as they have been attacked as un-Christian by Catholics and Protestants alike; but they are imposed upon the German people, and they have now been adopted by Mussolini. Anti-Semitism, always the tool of reactionaries, is bound to be part of Nazism and Fascism, and that is as true in the United States as anywhere else.

America's leading scientists recently put the fascist racial "theories" on the dissecting table. They found them foul and false to the core.

At a meeting held at the Hotel Commodore, New York City, on Thursday, December 29, 1938, three hundred outstanding anthropologists of the U. S. A. passed a resolution denouncing racial propaganda.

Looking at this question through the clear eyes of scientific truth these men of science concluded:

"The terms 'aryan' and 'semitic' have no racial significance whatsoever. . . .

"Anthropology provides no scientific basis for discrimination against any people on the ground of racial inferiority, religious affiliation, or linguistic heritage."

How Many Rich Jews?

Every oppressed nation, every minority group, has always faced a special form of anti-Semitism of its own. The English oppressors, in order to justify the suppression of Ireland, created a wide-spread belief among the English people that the Irish were "barbaric," "ignorant," "filthy," that they "could not take care of themselves"; that they "lived with the pigs." These vile lies were spread in order to deny Ireland her right to independence and freedom.

Similarly, the Southern slave-owners said of the Negro people that they were "lazy," "ignorant," "rapists," "inferior to the whites," in order to justify the horrible institution of slavery. These lies are still used against the Negro people in order to divide the white from the Negro, and in order to defend the institution of Jim-Crow and discrimination.

Anti-Semitism, like race prejudice and slander against oppressed nations, is therefore the means to justify the inhuman treatment of the Jews.

When it is successful in its foul purpose, how does anti-Semitism work? Here for example is a small New England manufacturing city. There are Jews working in the factories, there are a few Jewish storekeepers, there is perhaps a small factory owned by a Jew. The average worker does not think particularly about the Jews who work with him in his shop as Jews. They are individuals like anyone else; some he likes, some he doesn't. That is all there is to it. But say he has trouble with a Jewish storekeeper about a back bill he owes, or he thinks the storekeeper has overcharged him. (The storekeeper is probably just scraping along, getting about eighteen dollars a week out of his store.) Say the Jewish owners of the factory in which he works put through a fifteen per cent wage cut. Then he gets angry. He remembers things he has heard about Jews, the fables of Coughlin and other anti-Semites, and blames his troubles on the Jews, and not on the defects of the economic system which bring about the difficulties.

A few years ago *Fortune,* the magazine of big business, made a careful survey called *The Jew in America.* It found that the common beliefs about the economic position of the Jews were completely false. Take for instance the references to "international bankers" made so frequently by Father Coughlin and the other anti-Semites. Of the banking houses making foreign loans, J. P. Morgan, at the time of the *Fortune* survey, led all the rest, with over 19% of all the foreign loans. But does Father Coughlin ever mention J. P. Morgan? Several other non-Jewish firms followed J. P. Morgan in importance, and then came Kuhn, Loeb and Co., the largest Jewish banking house, with less than 3% of the foreign loans. Of the 420 directors in the 19 member firms of the New York Clearing House in 1933, only 30 or about 7% were Jews. They had a very inconspicuous role in heavy industry, steel, automobiles, coal, rubber, shipping. The only two important productive industries in which Jewish ownership was dominant were moving pictures and clothing manufacture.

For every wealthy Jew there are literally hundreds of thousands of poor and obscure Jews working in factories and sweat shops and stores. Jews feel the limitations of the present economic system as much as anyone else. Under the pressure of cut-throat competition and the demands of the wholesalers, Jewish drygoods stores and drug stores fail just as often as those run by men of any other origin. When Jewish and Italian workers went out on strike in Boston in the Garment Workers' Strike of 1936, certain

Jewish employers called out Irish policemen to arrest and intimidate the Jewish and Italian workers. The differences between the rich and the poor exists among Jews the same as among other people. What is necessary of course, is for workers to understand, first, the falseness of anti-Semitic propaganda, and second, the real causes of low wages and unemployment.

Today, as never before in our country, greed and power are fiercely attacking the American principle in order to "divide and rule." Those who would keep down the standard of American living, threaten also to subvert the democratic foundations of our country. Even now, what region of our country is most backward in standard of living and education and public health? It is that section of the South where the discrimination against the Negro is most intense, where he is still kept in a slave-like condition. A country cannot prosper, said Abraham Lincoln, while it is half-slave and half-free.

Those who foster anti-Semitism, we have seen, take their stand with the Black Hundreds and the pogrom-makers of Czarism, and the liars and forgerers who framed Captain Dreyfus. They reject the ideas of Thomas Paine, of Washington and Jefferson, of Jackson and Lincoln, of the liberators of mankind. They side with those who fear the people, who fear the kind of democratic development that has made the United States a leader in world progress. They want to turn the clock back in the United States to poverty, discrimination and intolerance.

We oppose anti-Semitism, then, not only because it is false and unfair, but because anti-Semitism and democracy cannot live side by side. What can we do to insure democracy and to eliminate anti-Semitism *at the root?*

First, of course, we must fight anti-Semitism directly — by education, by protesting every evidence of anti-Semitism, by the boycott, by giving aid to refugees. This is a fight in defence of the American Bill of Rights under which our people are not only protected against discrimination on account of religion and race, but are also guaranteed the right to speak their minds, to print books, pamphlets and newspapers, to have public meetings, to choose by secret ballot those who shall govern them. To allow any "whittling down" of the Bill of Rights is to allow its foundations to be undermined.

Second, we must put our democracy into the best working order, extend it throughout the length and breadth of our nation, make it penetrate thoroughly into our legislatures, factories, schools and courts. Hitler and Mussolini have declared themselves leaders in a crusade against democracy — *the way to defeat them is to make democracy work!*

Third and last — but most important of all — we must assure a sound basis and future for our democracy by guaranteeing all Americans economic security, employment at reasonable hours and for a living wage, a fair share in the productive wealth of their country. This is the decisive answer to the threat of anti-Semitism, to the dangers menacing our civil liberties.

The jobless and despairing, the hungry and the desperate — these are easier prey to the sinister forces who play upon their fears and prejudices, divert their wretchedness and anger upon the heads of the scape-goats, promise them an easy and direct escape from their difficulties.

FATHER COUGHLIN REPEATS A LIE

Is Father Coughlin's paper, Social Justice, using verbatim anti-Semitic falsehoods put out by Nazi propaganda agencies? Yes, says the American Jewish Congress. It quotes an article from Social Justice of March 6, 1939, and shows that it is identical with material contained in Sigilla Veri, a publication of the Nazi propaganda house of Ulrich Fleischhauer. The article in question purports to tell how Moses Montefiore, addressing an assembly of Jewish rabbis in Cracow, in 1840, advised them to get control of the press throughout the world in order to advance Jewish power. The whole story of course is a lie. No such assembly of Jewish rabbis ever took place in Cracow; Montefiore never visited that city; Simon Wolf, a Jewish writer supposed to have told of the meeting, never did so. Finally, the Jews don't control the press, in any country in the world. We doubt very much, however, whether the falsity of the story will stop Social Justice or, if they ever find out about it, its readers. Anti-Semites move in a strange half-world of their own, below the level of even intellectual curiosity.

From the NATION

POT AND KETTLE

By C. G. MONTEFIORE

In the course of the last thirty years there has been a considerable change in the estimate of the 'Pharisees' and Rabbis by Christian scholars. As I see things, the change has been for the better. The attack upon the Scribes and Pharisees in the Synoptic Gospels is no longer taken "at the foot of the letter." It is agreed that in A. D. 28 there were doubtless many black sheep among them, but it is also allowed that there were many white ones, as well as a large number of mixtures — grey sheep, not wholly white, but by no means completely black. Such a view of these old gentlemen is, I am convinced, much nearer to history and truth. It is not unnatural —it is indeed inevitable—that Christian scholars should think that even the good Rabbis were rather dense and foolish to oppose Jesus and his teaching, and should assume that, in their contests with him, they (as the Gospels would lead us to believe) were, historically, always in the wrong, and that Jesus was always in the right. One cannot legitimately object to this. It is sometimes suggested that excess of light can sometimes dazzle. That is an excuse for the wrong-headed Rabbis.

Again, while there used to be a tendency among English scholars, meekly following the lead of German Lutherans, to assume that the Rabbis were ethically a shabby and shoddy lot of creatures, because they were legalists, and a legal religion is a bad religion, and can produce only bad peoople (formalists, hypocrites, self-righteous men and the like), seeing that the Law, or even law, is the strength of sin—here, too, there has been a vast alteration. A beloved and distinguished theologian hazarded the theory that 50 B. C. - A. D. 50 was a specially bad century, so far as Rabbis were concerned — bad ethically and bad religiously — and that the purgations of A. D. 70 and A. D. 135 produced a great change. Thus Jesus (as recorded in the Gospels, and more especially in Mark) was justified, but Paul was thrown over, for the Rabbis after A. D. 135 were certainly not less legalists, but even more confirmed

From Rabbinic Anthology. *Macmillan Company, London.*

and thorough-going legalists, than their predecessors of 50 B. C.-A. D. 50, and yet ex hypothesis they were religiously and ethically far superior.

This advance in impartiality and in historical detachment is the more noteworthy, because Christian scholars are ab initio debarred from saying, "There were faults on both sides," for where Jesus is concerned there can be no faults. He makes the one exception to the otherwise universal rule. Christian scholars can take refuge every now and then, as Dr. Martineau did, only in the perilous hypothesis of editorial exaggeration and unauthenticity. All the gentle and beautiful and loving things in the Gospels are authentic; all, or most, or many, of the fierce invectives and of the commitments to hell and to its aeonian flames are either unauthentic, or they do not mean what they seem to mean.

The advance must be gratefully acknowledged by Jews, and especially by those Jews who reverence both Jesus and Hillel, both Paul and R. Johanan b. Zakkai.

Yet, perhaps, in the use of the words Jewish and Christian, there is still room for improvement. Incidentally it may be mentioned that whereas Jewish estimates of Jesus and Paul were often inadequate (the fault has been by no means all on one side), yet, as regards the two adjectives, Jews sin less than Christians. For the Jews do not habitually use the adjective, "Jewish" to mean "ethically and religiously perfect": Christians are much more inclined to use the adjective Christian in this sort of way. Nor would such a use much matter, if it were not for the human love of foils and contrasts. And what better and more obvious contrast to Christian than Jewish?

The primary meaning of the two adjectives is purely neutral. If I speak of the Jewish religion or of the Christian religion, I pronounce no verdict as to their goodness or badness any more than if I speak of the Buddhist or the Mohammedan religion.

Gradually, however, I suppose, Christians began to use the adjective (as the substantive) Christian in a special sense. Small blame to them if things had stopped there. The great Oxford Dictionary says that "Christian" is used to mean "showing character and conduct consistent with discipleship to Christ; marked by genuine piety; following the precepts and example of Christ; Christlike." Similarly the substantive is used for "one who exhibits the spirit, and follows the precepts and example, of Christ; a believer in Christ who is characterised by genuine piety." The first example given of this use of the adjective is from Hooker, 1597; one would have thought that earlier instances could have been discovered.

But if, in addition to its obvious neutral sense, "Christian" means something very excellent and mature, what must "Jewish" mean? Clearly something poor, immature or even bad, for the two adjectives almost inevitably tended to be used as opposites. A parallel was at hand in the common contrast between the Old Testament and the New. For instead of what I venture to think is the proper and historic excellences, and each has its own defects, the usual line taken is to find a series of contrasts to the following effect. The O. T. is preparation; the N. T. is fulfilment. In the first is immaturity, in the second, perfection; or, again, the virtue of the first is justice, of the second, love; in the one is found revenge, in the second, forgiveness; in the one, narrow tribalism, in the other, all-embracing charity. The God of the one is, on the whole, a fierce and cruel God; the God of the other is always a God of mercy, forgiveness and love. The last contrast is, perhaps, the queerest of all when one remembers the many sayings about lovingkindness and forgiveness in the O. T., and the not infrequent denunciations and imprecations in the New. (In some ways it is rather a pleasant thing that in the O. T. Sheol has not yet developed into hell.)

Now far be it from me to deny that there are passages in the O. T. — sayings e. g. about God, or put into the mouth of God — which are cruel, particularistic, revengeful and immature. But it is inaccurate, as well as insulting, to stamp these passages as specifically Jewish. Yet this is what frequently happens. For as Jewish has become the foil and the contrast to the Christian, and as Christian can connote only perfection, the more narrow, revengeful and particularistic a given O. T. passage is, the more it is specifically Jewish. Thus Esther becomes the most Jewish book in the O. T., and Jonah the least.

But is not the fine ore of a religion its characteristic and essence (if there is an adequate amount of it) rather than its dross? Is not a religion most itself when at its best? Am I to judge the religion of Jesus by "ye fools and blind," "ye hypocrites," "fill up the measure of your fathers, serpents, brood of vipers, who shall not escape the judgement of hell; it shall be more tolerable for Tyre and Sidon at the day of judgement than for you; depart from me, ye cursed, into everlasting fire, prepared for the devil and his angels," or shall I appraise his religion rather by "love your enemies," "there is nothing from without, that, entering into a man, can defile him," "her sins, which are many, are forgiven, for she loved much; ye know not what manner of spirit ye are of, for the son of man is not come to destroy men's lives, but to save them." In spite of all the specious excuses of the centuries, the one set of sentences are just dross; the others are the essence and the ore.

Again, Christian is an adjective to denominate a living religion, with its millions of adherents. But the adjective is used also to indicate the perfect religion. For hell and eternal punishment, and the virulence of hatred towards heretics and infidels, have all retreated into the background. Christian means sweet reasonableness, toleration, charity, love. But have those Christian writers who still use the word Jewish in a bad sense any vivid recollection of the fact that Judaism, in this feature, at any rate, like Christianity, is also a living religion? Do they suppose that Judaism today is "Jewish" in the "low" sense of the word, or that it culminated with the writer of Esther? Let us for the moment assume that the O. T. really deserved those strong condemnations which are applied to it. But how far has Judaism today freed itself from any O. T. dross? How far does it cherish the ore, and overlook or ignore the dross?

Am I to call the horrors of the Crusades Christian? Or the burnings and tortures of the Inquisition, or for that matter the burnings of Anabaptists and Catholics by Protestants? Are those Christian? Surely not.

A gifted Jewish writer has just called Esther the most un-Jewish book in the Hebrew Bible. I think that there is far more justification for this unusual pronouncement than for any stigmatisation of it in the opposite sense. At all events, let the same tests be applied to both religions. If Christian means only what is good, and if all the evil is ignored, forgotten or explained away, let Judaism profit by the same processes. For the second is a living religion no less than the first.

I do not so much mind the contrast between law and grace; law with its servitude over against grace with its freedom. On the whole, the Law is much better understood today than forty years ago, though we find no less distinguished a scholar than Dr. Oesterley (really Bousset:) writing as follows: "In the later Greek period Judaism, as is well known, had, in comparison with the religion of the prophets and earlier psalmists, deteriorated through the blighting influence of the Law." The historic truth is that while there was some deterioration, there was also some advance. Monotheism was becoming more definite, the Law was becoming less priestly, ethics were becoming more complete. On the whole, the religion of the Rabbis, inferior to that of the Prophets in some respects, was in others — e. g. in refinement, delicacy, pervasiveness — superior. And as to the Psalter, it is quite on the cards that some of the noblest psalms were by no means the earliest.

It might, indeed, be argued that the O. T. is much more often particularistic than universalist, so much more often, as regards enemies and God's relations to the enemies of Israel, revengeful and cruel than tender and forgiving, that it is not unfair to use O. T. as an adjective to signify these disagreeable qualities, either absolutely, or in contrast to the predominating N. T. character of sweetness and love. Moreover, as Jews persist in limiting their Bible to the O. T., and in regarding that O. T. as religiously and morally perfect and divine, it is not unreasonable to speak of the bad passages and qualities of the O. T. as specifically Jewish. Have they ever been repudiated by Jews till quite modern times, and are they not even now repudiated only by a handful of Jews, namely, by the modernists and Liberals? Is not Purim, among all Orthodox Jewish communities, still one of the most popular of Jewish festivals? Is not the scroll on which it is written called *the* scroll, *the* Megillah, as if it were of all the scrolls the dearest and the best?

There are, I think, several lines of reply to these arguments.

(1) I am not clear that, as regards the percentage of good and bad passages, it is numbers which should count, even if it be true, and even if we assume (which I refuse to do off-hand) that the bad passages in the O. T. largely outnumber the good ones. The O. T. religion, in my judgment, is then most distinctive, and is then most true to itself and to its own evolving excellence, if we regard the "good" passages as more of its essence than the "bad" ones. The bad ones are the defects and the dross; and do not all religions have their defects and their dross which it may take them long to get rid of and to purge away? It may have taken, or it may take,

the Jewish religion a long while fully and openly to divest and cleanse itself of its impurities.

(2) It is true that a most unfortunate "fundamentalism" — a most unfortunate conception of the Pentateuch and of the whole Hebrew Bible — compelled, and still compels, Orthodox Jews to regard all its teachings as perfect and divine; but nevertheless, with that delightful inconsistency which is so customary in human nature, the doctrine actually put forward by Jewish theologians and divines became gradually purified. While the "bad" Biblical passages were theoretically unrepudiated, they were either carefully ignored, or ingeniously, if not very ingenuously, explained away. Today it may safely be asserted that what constitutes Judaism is a living religion, not a museum curiosity. As to Purim, what is really celebrated is the great deliverance. But there is no real hatred of enemies brought in; no virulent cursings and imprecations. At the worst, Haman has become a sort of Jewish Guy Fawkes.

(3) I do not deny that the old Rabbis' religion was prevailingly particularist. The enemies of Israel were the enemies of God. From one point of view to regard the enemies of your nation or of your religious community as being also the enemies of God is a gross offence, but from another point of view it paves the way to the gradual realization of the fact that God, if He be indeed the All-Father, *can* have no enemies. The very idea is ludicrous and absurd. It may, moreover, be noted that, in certain ways and in some passages, there is a fuller and more delicate universalism in the Rabbinic literature than in any portion of the O. T.

Thus to use the word Jewish to mean something religiously and morally imperfect and bad, and to use the word Christian to mean something religiously and morally perfect and good, seems to me to measure two living religions with unequal weights. What would be thought of a Jew who, writing a history of Christianity, spoke of cruelty, persecution and intolerance as specifically Christian? And yet, what endless examples he could find and give of ardent Christians who in deed and writing were cruel, persecuting and intolerant! "In the tortures and auto-da-fe's of the Inquisition, in the blood bath which accompanied the capture of Jerusalem by the Crusaders, in the fires of Smithfield, in the doctrine of everlasting hell fire, in the deaths of

Bruno and Servetus, the true character of Christianity is conspicuously revealed." What a shocking sentence.

But something of the same sort can be said about Judaism, and it would hardly be noticed. To take a modern instance almost at random. In 1937 there was published an excellent and most useful little Introduction to the O. T. by a Methodist, Dr. W. L. Northridge. In the pages about Esther we have the usual business, and the author lets himself go in the easiest and simplest manner. "The intensity of the hatred which the book reveals is indicated in IX, 13-16, where the demand is made for a second butchery of the non-Jewish population. Here, and in VIII, 7-14, we see Jewish vindictiveness at its worst." Nevertheless, Esther "serves a useful purpose at least in setting the contrast between unworthy elements in Judaism and the Christian spirit of love to all, even to one's enemies." And how often has the Christian spirit of love to all been displayed in fact? Is it displayed in Matthew XXIII or XXV, 41, 46? Is it displayed in John VIII, 44, XVII, 9? Is it displayed in the Christian attitude to heretics and infidels and unbelievers from the days of the Athanasian Creed almost down to the eighteen hundred years after the death of the Founder? There is a good deal of glass in both our houses. We had better not throw stones at one another.

If "Jewish vindictiveness" is intended to mean only that vindictiveness which Jews, like Christians or Mohammedans, or any other body of men, have shown or can show, no exception could be taken to the phrase. But would Dr. Northbridge write equally facilely about Christian vindictiveness? I doubt it. I think he means by "Jewish Christian vindictiveness" that vindictiveness is characteristically Jewish, a characteristic mark of Jews and of Judaism. And against such a meaning I must protest. "Unworthy elements in Judaism": doubtless there have been such; but have there been no unworthy elements in Christianity? It may be the result of powerlessness or of constant oppression, but, as a matter of fact, cruelty to enemies has been far more conspicuously displayed in *deed* during the last 1800 years by Christians than by Jews. As to *words,* I have already called attention in this "Anthology" to Augustine's appalling chapters about hell, and yet those chapters have found their equals and even their superiors, if one may use the word, in many Christian writings throughout the ages. Whereas, if one wished for "contrasts," it would be possible to quote remarkable words of forgiveness and gentleness from Jewish sufferers at Christian hands.

Nevertheless, the ideal remains. Christians have every right to quote with pride the sayings of Jesus about the love of enemies. And Jews have no less right to quote with pride the Rabbinic sayings that he who is not merciful and kind cannot be of the true seed of Israel, or that he who is reviled and does not revile, returning good for evil, is like the sun when he sets forth in his might. For the adjectives Jewish and Christian, if used in a non-neutral sense, can and should mean only that which is good and tender and pure. God may be conceived as a hater of sin, but not of the sinner. In that respect Beruria (1290-1) was more "Jewish," and spoke more according to the true, emerging essence or "nature" of Judaism (as also of Christianity) than the Psalmist (CXLV, 20).

JEWS AND COMMUNISM

In the United States, where the Jews enjoy the greatest freedom and opportunity, the percentage of Communists among them is insignificant. There are four and a half million Jews in this country. In the last presidential election the Communist candidate polled 80,159 votes out of a total popular vote of 45,646,817. In New York, where two million Jews live, the Communist party was ruled off the ballot because their candidate received only 31,987 votes. The leaders of the Communist party in the United States are Earl Browder, William Z. Foster, Clarence Hathaway, James Ford, Robert Minor, William Patterson, Harry Haywood, Ella Reave Bloor, and Max Bedacht. Not one is a Jew. The magazine *Fortune,* after a careful investigation in 1936, stated that "of the twenty-seven thousand United States Communists, only 3,500 to 4,000 of the members of the party were Jews." Of course there may be many more Jews not members of the Communist party, who are sympathetic with its aims. But together they do not form more than one or two percent of the total Jewish population. "For every revolutionary Jew," as *Fortune* correctly states, "there are thousands of Jewish capitalists, shopkeepers, traders, and the like, who stand to lose everything in a revolution."

From the article "Some Facts about Jews" by Philip S. Bernstein,
in HARPER'S MAGAZINE, *April, 1939.*

"UNSER KAMPF" FOR JEWS AND GENTILES

By A. M. SMITH

—"their atheism will vanish and in its place will spread the Divine Communism of the Prophet Micah."

EVERYONE with a humanitarian spirit cannot but glory in the splendid record of Justice Brandeis just retired. We also dare to expect as much from our Professor Frankfurter. Indeed so many good things are being done in America in the spirit of good-will that the moral chaos in other parts of the world is all the more crushing to our sensibilities.

And yet we need not and must not be crushed thereby. We must face the facts and pray for guidance with an earnestness and perseverance commensurate with world conditions. How then, willing minds ask, can we make the world safe for humanity? How make humanity safe for itself?

Would that Jew and Gentile alike would forget the fish that swallowed Jonah and see in Jonah himself the personification of our own faithless indifference today to the Divine commission to go preach and live righteousness among the Ninevites of today!

Do you say that this is mere religious frenzy? Well, down deep in your truest, profoundest thinking, do you even hope to find any other way to make the world safe for humanity? This must be "Unser Kampf"! We all are threatened with terrifying "Drangs nach Osten" and we scarcely offer even appeasements.

Witness our relative failure to be vitally Christian, socially just, in both our home and our foreign fields. The writer has never experienced such veritable terror as his present fear that Americans individually and collectively will lose their very souls and all that "salvation" may imply as we look on inactive and almost unfeeling while fiendish murderers ravage Spain and China.

Think it through, reader. Whose fate is the more tragic, they who "die on their feet fighting rather than live forever on their knees," or we who walk about in the starkness of spiritual death? "He that thinketh to save his life, shall lose it."

Furthermore, can Judaism profess innocence regarding world conditions that threaten its own very existence? Really, what about God's "Priestly People"? Have they made the salvation of Nineveh their chief

Original Article

and constant mission in the world, or have they been taking ships to Tarshish? There are veritable storms on the sea of Life today and the pagan sailors, now as of yore, sense something wrong in the lives of Jonahs, Christian and Jewish, and they are being thrown overboard.

Now, many Christians who are not shirking their own responsibilities, feel that sixteen millions of Jews (if there remain that many in their modern exile) are none too many, working at their very best, to help make the ethical monotheism of the Hebrew Prophets and of Jesus really effective in the world today. Surely our Jewish fellowmen now finally see that the world will continue to crush them unless with every ability and power of perseverance they help *evangelize,* not combat the world.

Why lament for Palestine, beautiful and appropriate as is the ideal? It is dangerous to live on the road from Berlin to Bagdad, or on that from Rome to Ethiopia and Somaliland. Finally why fear the assimilation that might ensue from a definite effort to "evangelize" the world and transform its motives?

Is it not far better to lose your life nationally or racially, if really necessary, in a reformed world which you have helped to make than to be destroyed by that world in its unregenerate condition?

Therefore let all religions face these life and death problems with the courage and perseverance of the "Atheistic Radicals" of the world and their atheism will vanish and in its place will spread the Divine Communism of the prophet Micah: "Have we not all one Father? Hath not one God created us? Why then do we deal treacherously every man against his brother?"

Therefore let no one today, Jew or Gentile, "take ship to Tarshish" for he that thinketh to save his life shall surely lose it.

POISON IN THE MELTING-POT

By GEORGE BRITT —*"this could not have been written a year ago."*

The German-American Bund at Madison Square Garden, New York, on February 20, gave the worst exhibition of Jew-baiting ever seen in the United States. It is doubtful if anything remotely approaching it in boldness and volume was ever staged here before. It has been sufficiently described—the keynote banners "Stop Jewish Domination of Christian America!" and "Wake Up, America! Smash Jewish Communism," the uniformed Nazis gleefully strong-arming dissent, prolonged applause for Father Coughlin, speakers dinning into the ears of the audience fierce abuse of Jews while at the same time flag-waving for Americanism.

Alongside this mass effort at character assassination it is quite justifiable to place two other attacks upon Jews, stabbings with knives instead of words, one occurring a few days before the Bund rally and the other a few days afterward. I would not overemphasize the coincidence. I haven't traced a direct connection of cause and effect. Still, they belong together.

On the evening of February 15 a little old bent, bearded Jew, past sixty, Hyman Mankas, was going home to Brooklyn. Two passengers, Joseph Quinn and Grant Martin, according to police charges, began insulting him in the subway. He left the train, went up an escalator, and got on the elevated. The men pursued. They got off at his station, the accusation runs, pulled his beard, beset him with cries of "lousy Jew" and "Jew refugee from Germany." A Jewish lad of eighteen who came to help him was knocked down and cut three times on the leg with a knife. When brought into court the two husky prisoners pleaded that they had acted in self-defense. An indictment on charges more serious than the original third-degree assault is still being sought.

The second stabbing of a Jew occurred in the early morning of February 23 on the half-deserted platform of the Grand Central subway station. As Irving Berger and a woman companion were waiting for a train, Berger relates, three men walked up and shouted, "Dirty Yidel." Those are fighting words. The young Jew struck back. And

From the Nation, *April, 1939*

then, according to eyewitnesses, one of the trio held Berger against the guard-rail while a second stabbed him. He was cut five times, once in the abdomen quite seriously, receiving wounds which kept him two weeks in a hospital. Two men were arrested and gave their names as William and Joseph Molloy. Indicted for felonious assault, they pleaded not guilty.

Without more data it would be hysterical to read pogrom psychology into these two unprovoked attacks on Jews by non-Jews, notwithstanding the anti-Semitic battle cries. But it can be said that these stabbings are accurate symbols, at least, of what is bound to result from the anti-Jewish rabble-rousing now going on in New York. The German-American Bund rally was unfortunately no more than a magnified conglomerate of numerous other meetings held every week in New York, in obscure halls and on street corners, from Yorkville to the far edges of the city, all inducing hatred and inciting to violence.

Zealous proselyting by the Bund is to be taken for granted. But of late organizers have been busy also among other racial groups—Hungarians, Swiss, Scandinavians, Syrians, and Arabs—unifying them with the common denominator of anti-Semitism. All Bund meetings sell the official weekly paper *Deutscher Weckruf,* the "Protocols of Zion," and other anti-Semitic writings with incredibly moronic cartoons, seldom omitting Father Coughlin's *Social Justice,* Pelley's *Liberation,* and the rest.

Members of the Christian Front, an organization in the main Irish rather than German, deserve special citation as Coughlin's storm troopers. Only the brown uniforms are lacking. This group is strongest in Brooklyn, though it also meets in Manhattan. A delegation wearing "C. F." buttons attended a united veterans' meeting at the Academy of Music in Brooklyn on March 19 and booed loudly when the Jewish representative on the program, the distinguished Dr. Elias Lieberman, rose to speak. They were ejected, but when the audience started home it found "C. F." men waiting at the door, shouting for Coughlin, Hitler, Mussolini, and Franco.

The weekly programs of the Christian Front last summer featured the redoubtable Russell J. Dunn along with the group's own leader, a noisy stripling by the name of John F. Cassidy. Dunn has been screaming anti-Semitism with few interruptions since 1917, when he served a workhouse sentence for disorders provoked by his slogan, "Jews are all slackers." This experience he still refers to in self-indulgent emotionalism. Dunn works up his audiences with the skill of a Holy Roller revivalist until the men and women sit muttering, not "Amen, Brother," but "Kill the kikes."

During Dunn's recent illness his place has been taken most often by Floyd A. Caridi, president of the Flatbush Anti-Communist League, whose favorite subtlety is, "The first thing I do when I walk into a store is to call for a Christian salesman." Christian Front speakers have lifted certain Bund phrases which they repeat tirelessly: "President Rosenfeld," "the pink lady in the White House," and "the little red flower in City Hall." They warn the Mayor that they are going to ride up with guns. Members know their cues and are quick to boo at "Perkins" or "refugees," and to cheer "Coughlin" or "Hitler."

Long-suffering under abuse as they have been, the Jewish War Veterans at last turned out a thousand or more strong at a Christian Front open-air meeting held last fall at East Seventeenth Street and Kings Highway, Brooklyn. The meeting was smothered, the speakers retreated, Caridi was struck, and the program never started.

At a recent meeting of the Christian Front in Prospect Hall, Brooklyn, the Franco film, "Spain in Arms," was shown, with speakers adding comment. The recorded voice on the film itself did not mention Jews although it repeatedly insinuated the idea. When a group of prisoners from the International Brigade with somewhat Semitic features was shown, it advised, "Watch their faces closely." "Oy, Oy," responded the audience. "Look at the kikes, the Christ-killers, the mockies." One speaker solemnly warned, "I have been informed that the Jews are about to plunge America into a war with Hitler and Mussolini, and that Madame Perkins and President Roosevelt are in on the deal." Socialists, Communists, and Jews received a common denunciation. But it remained for the chairman, one Harold Walsh, to accomplish a dialectical masterpiece with the blast: "The Jewish War Veterans can denounce communism all day and all night, and they can call themselves Americans, but we members of the Christian Front are not fooled—we will deal with these people when the time comes, and we will pay special attention to Jews who sing the Star-Spangled Banner." Even Father Coughlin pretends to attack only Communist Jews. But the Brooklyn disciple makes all Jews Communists.

Dunn was the principal speaker at a meeting held in February at the McKinley Square Gardens in the Bronx, in the name of the Veterans' Organization of the Christian Crusaders for Social Justice. The chairman was John O'Shea, head of the Queens Committee of the Flying Squad for Americanism. Praising Father Coughlin, Dunn condemned the Catholic church for not giving him more ardent support and for harboring his critics. He lingered fondly over Spanish atrocities. All the trouble in Spain, he said, was due to Jewish meddling. He reviled and assailed the Jews, winding up with "We must drive the lousy"— pausing here and waiting for the audience to scream "Jews, Jews, Jews." Then he resumed, "Shut up. "I'll do the talking here. It's people like you who get me in jail. I mean Communists." And the audience roared with delight.

A meeting of the Christian Crusaders against Communists, held in Yorkville on February 13 with about 500 in attendance, started with an appeal to the American Nationalist Party, Italian Fascists, the German-American-Bund, and the Christian Front to join hands with the Crusaders. Then the Franklin forgeries were brought up; then Coughlin, "greatest man since Jesus Christ," destined to be the Franco of America —cheers for Father Coughlin; then Coughlin's identification of the Bolsheviks as Jews; praise for William Dudley Pelley; eulogy of Hitler.

A speaker told how Jews had taken over New York while the Irish and Germans were away fighting the war. "What are you going to do about it?" Back came the shouts, "Kill the bastards!" The speaker smiled indulgently. That would be too much trouble. There mightn't be room to bury them all. Maybe the East River was the solution. With the Jews in control of everything, he said, he very much feared that violence was coming. How his blood had tingled, he recalled, when he saw the cops beating up Communists in front of the City Hall nine years ago, and he had stepped in and helped. He described a newspaper photograph of a policeman beating a Spanish Loyalist sympathizer in California. His hope was for a return of the good old police field days — "you know what I mean."

New York's plainest current display of anti-Semitism is the weekly picketing of radio station WMCA at Fifty-second Street and Broadway every Sunday afternoon in protest against the station's demand for advance editing of Father Coughlin's speeches. Coughlin's refusal to speak over WMCA on those terms has been a boon to anti-Semites. It was the most useful peg of the winter on which to hang demonstrations demanding toleration for his intolerance.

The first picketing was on Sunday, December 18, after a big rally for the previous Thursday by the Committee for the Defense of American Constitutional Rights. Attendance at the rally was predominantly Catholic—Christian Front members and the credulous worshipers of Coughlin. One organizer was a promoter by the name of Allen Zoll, then head of American Patriots, Inc., an associate of Bund Führer Fritz Kuhn. A few weeks later Zoll was to raise the anti-Semitic outcry against Felix Frankfurter's appointment to the Supreme Court. Since then he has been more quiet, and Christian Front speakers call him a renegade. Another was Edward James Smythe, a fellow-worker with the Bund, a user of multifarious letterheads, publisher of fly-by-night propaganda sheets, and for years a petty dealer in anti-Semitism. Smythe's most recent creation is the Protestant War Veterans of the United States, whose banner was in the line at the first picketing. The Christian Front turns out faithfully every Sunday, and there are numerous pickets whose rich German accents suggest a Bund connection.

The anti-Semitism of the picket line exceeds Father Coughlin's simultaneous incitements over the air. The pickets shout, "Wake up, America — Buy Christian Only," "Down with the Jewish Warmongers," and "No Kosher Frankfurters." An occasional "Heil Hitler" is heard. They paste anti-Jewish and "Buy Christian" stickers on walls and automobile windshields. They wear Coughlin's picture in their hatbands and carry it on banners. Their banners display the slogans: "Out with Internationalists—America for Americans," "Palestine! Has the Arab side ever been told over the radio?" "No More Refugees," "Is Flammsky going to decide your radio programs?" — a reference to Donald Flamm, president of WMCA.

The racial melting-pot of New York City invites hate propagandists. If you doubt that the Bund sees its chance, read the *Weckruf's* complaint of arrogance in the old-stock Americans: ". . .the nativistic spirit, the arrogant assumption that an unwritten clause of the Constitution grants them a patent of superiority . . . that unless you can trace your ancestry to some shoemaker or weaver in Britain, you are a citizen only by tolerance." This, from the fanatical Aryan racists who would make life unbearable in Germany for all but "pure" Germans, may sound like a joke. But the intent is serious. The Nazis are out to exploit every racial antipathy.

The Irish, thanks to Father Coughlin, have been enlisted by thousands as allies and instruments of Nazi anti-Jewish propaganda. Through the anti-Communist and pro-Franco trimmings supplied by Coughlin the campaign has won much useful help. Strong support is furnished by the Brooklyn diocesan weekly the *Tablet,* edited by Patrick F. Scanlan. Apparently the *Tablet* has thrived on this policy, lifting its circulation to a high of 100,000 and widening its appeal beyond Brooklyn. Coughlin is defended also by the influential anti-Communist publicist Father Edward Lodge Curran, although Father Curran has publicly washed his hands of Russell J. Dunn.

The Italians have fallen in line patriotically. The paper *Il Grido della Stirpe* regularly attacks the Jews; last fall it sponsored an anti-Jewish radio program over the Jersey City station WHOM which almost cost the station its license. Italian Fascists and the Nazis fraternize, and black-shirted *Squadristi* attend Bund celebrations. Teachers in New York schools report spasmodic downpours of anti-Jewish leaflets and stickers, and outbursts of defamatory mottoes chalked on the blackboards. These have been traced to children from Nazi and Fascist homes. And it is not uncommon in foreign-neighborhood schools for a current-events class dealing with Hitler or Stalin to be interrupted by some youngster speaking out to the teacher, "Those are lies and you are red. I reported you to the Friday-night meeting."

This accout of anti-Semitism in New York City today could not have been written a year ago. These things now in abundant open manifestation were not happening then. But in 1939 anti-Semitism in New York has ceased to be whispered and has become an open instrument of demagoguery, a vast outlet for idle energies. If a few stabbings occur after all this poison of hatred has been poured into the ears of dissatisfied small people, who can be surprised?

DON'T WAIT FOR THE SUPERMAN

By M. M. COADY

—Small groups of ordinary people are the basic cells of a new order.

THIS IS THE era of great happenings — great scientific discoveries, great wars, great depressions, great corporations, great dictatorships, great fears, great hopes. It is not surprising that many people, when they pause to think of the cause of our present turmoil and its possible solution, feel that only the leadership of a superman with a new scheme applied on a grandiose scale can bring any semblance of order and harmony and justice into the lives of men here on earth. The cynical old saying, "It had better be good," applied to any proposed scheme for social improvement, gives way to another comment: "It had better be big."

We in the adult education movement in eastern Canada are not awaiting the arrival of a spectacular leader bearing a ready-made solution of our current problems. We hold that such a leader could not solve our problems even if we were the most enlightened group of individuals in Canada, for an aggregation of enlightened and efficient individuals does not necessarily mean an efficient nation.

If we are going to have an efficient nation we must first have efficient local communities. If we are going to attempt to reconstruct society we must turn on in our local communities in a given area all the best available social, economic intellectual and cultural forces. We can do this through a program of widespread education in that area followed by participation in all the social and economic affairs of our territory. We will have to restrain any desire we may have of offering our program to the whole world, yet to attain any significance our activities must embrace an area that represents the interwoven interests of all our people, primarily producers and industrial workers, and it must be large enough to bring results. Eastern Canada is just such an area.

We have over a million people here engaged in the major industries of our country and providing enough business to demonstrate the validity of our program. That so many of

From THE EXTENSION BULLETIN, *Antigonish, N. S., March 3, 1939* you are here from almost every section of the Maritimes with the express purpose of equipping yourselves for leadership in your local communities makes it still easier to picture the area from which you come as the battle ground for our first attack against national problems. . .

But whilst your aim is first and foremost the improvement of conditions in your own communities, local or sectional or occupational loyalities must not be over-emphasized, good as they may seem, in any program which has at heart the welfare of all the people. It is quite possible that the people of Nova Scotia might take an attitude of isolation that would retard the progress of the people of the remainder of eastern Canada. So might the other provinces.

In the promotion of co-operative business, both on the producer and consumer side, we must have a certain amount of volume before worth-while results can be attained. If the fishermen, for instance, are going to market mackerel efficiently they must have a sufficient volume of it. In Nova Scotia there are only a few communities producing this commodity. If these communities keep apart, even though doing business co-operatively as separate units, they will ruin the progress of the whole business. On the consumer side it is easily apparent that the various provinces must get into the movement in large enough numbers to provide the necessary volume for efficient co-operative business.

Our community problems cannot be solved satisfactorily except in the light of the bigger field — our field, Eastern Canada. It is often hard for our people to see this. They are prone to think that local action will solve all their difficulties, that they can stand aloof from groups in other communities in neighboring provinces having similar problems. Study will reveal the error in their thinking. Even groups whose problems are dissimilar cannot stand apart in a real program of social reconstruction.

The miners, for instance, cannot solve their problems independently of the farmers and fishermen. The latter need money, consumer goods and services just as urgently as do the miners, and since any worthwhile movement for social improvement involves reform in the business of banking, buying and selling, the miners can work out their best interests only by joining hands with these other groups. Working alone, as occupational groups, the farmers or fishermen or miners would be able to make a very small dent on a business set-up, which has shown so little respect for their welfare in the past.

Our program of adult education and activity in co-operative ventures will work many changes, but the most vital and most important of these will be a change in our personal mentality. We will think and speak no longer in the singular of the first personal pronoun, in the terms of the "I" and the "mine," but in the highest interest of all groups working toward a better social order. The phrases of "our country" and "our government" will assume a deeper significance when through our co-operative activities we play our part in running the country's business and it comes home to us that we, indeed, are the state. . . .

Perhaps it is disappointing to those who await the great leader with the grand gesture—this theory that the solution of our national problems begins with the efforts of small groups of ordinary men and women in comparatively unimportant communities. But that is what we firmly believe and, judging from your presence here today, that is what you believe also. . . We will undertake to achieve greatness in our section of the Dominion through the quiet, faithful and intelligent performance of the humble business of everyday living. And by "toiling upward" together in the program of education and action which we have set ourselves here we will reach heights of thought and experience that will enrich our personal lives as well as the lives of our fellow workers, and inspire other sections of the country to follow our example.

Suppose schools dotted the landscape in doctrinnaire rivalry as churches do. Suppose parents were so loyal to their kind of school that their children were never allowed to talk freely with children of other schools. Suppose teachers must be certified for orthodox educational conformity, like candidates for ordination to the ministry. The school system would fall apart in silly, futile bickering. And this is what has happened to our religion. With all our enthusiastic devotion to the independence which splits off from others for the sake of absolute independence, the result has been denominational groups so split by differences inside each group that there are Baptists far more opposed to other Baptists than they are opposed to Methodists or Presbyterians. — Bernard Clausen, *in the* Journal Of The National Education Association.

MART, ROSTRUM, ARENA, OR TEMPLE

By DAN B. BRUMMITT

—"In honor preferring one another."

The editor of this *Advocate* has done his share — and some think a little more than his share — to glorify Methodist Union.

He has no apology to make for that. But neither does he cherish any illusions about union. He is as well aware as the next Methodist that union will not be a good thing whether or no. It could turn out to be a very bad thing.

If the three churches go into it as though we were three nations writing a commercial treaty, each seeking to give as little and gain as much as its shrewdest diplomacy might contrive, Methodist Union will be nothing to celebrate.

If we go into it in any calculating spirit whatsoever, one group self-satisfied because of what it seems to be gaining, and another group resentful because of what it seems to be losing, how may we think to ask God's approval on the sorry total of such gains and losses?

And just now, before we all get to debating the details, before we get too much excited over the nearness of the Uniting Conference, one of our most important urgencies is to make a covenant with ourselves and with God.

We need to resolve that, God helping us, The Methodist Church — to use the new name — shall not not come to birth in an infected house.

Some of the dangers of infection which are likely to be considered in these pages from time to time are already well known to many. Others are so deceptive that they are not so easily recognized.

There is, for example, the very real danger of infection from a fever which grows by what it feeds on — the fever of a lopsided personal anxiety.

The new church will take over a great ecclesiastical machine, staffed by thousands of men and women, possessing various degrees of expert competence — pastors, educators, secretaries, editors, administrators, bishops — the directors and operators, which a highly organized, many-branched corporation must employ.

Practically all of these workers love their work. Most of them accept it as a vocation from God. But there

Editorial in The Christian Advocate, *November, 1938* are those among us who love also the security and prestige of their positions. Quite naturally, they wish to round out their lives of usefulness in the work they feel best able to do.

This is an old, old desire. It was hoary when Methodists were an obscure and despised people. In those days only a simpleton would join the Methodist movement because of what there might be in it for him. But it was in the church from which Methodism came.

This desire for church place is older than the Protestant or Roman Catholic history. It is older than Christendom itself. There's Bible for it, in the very morning of Israel's ecclesiastical history, "Put me, I pray thee, into one of the priest's offices, that I may eat a piece of bread." Our Lord spoke of it more strongly than His own church has done.

But now this has for us Methodists a new seriousness. In the church we are now forming there will be need to combine, to merge, and even to abandon some existing agencies. We must carry as little excess baggage as possible into the new day.

But nothing can be done in this direction without hardship; in some instances any action at all will produce seeming injustices. Every care must be taken to prevent suffering — and, first of all, suffering among those who are least able to bear it. Union is worth much, but union at any price would be too dear.

Our difficulties will arise in another quarter. All questions of hardship aside, we may easily have overmuch studying about place. The processes of union will make that almost inevitable. When it does not appear among the officials themselves, it may be found among their friends.

If two churches are to unite, which pastor is to drop out? If two boards are to be merged, whch members of the two staffs, from office boys to executives, are to be kindly but firmly advised to "seek another connection" within a reasonable time? If church papers are to be reorganized, which editors shall stay, and which shall be "released"? And, in the highest of all places within the church's gift, which bishops shall be assigned to the supposedly more desirable jurisdictions?

In all this unavoidable cleavage between the more favored and the less, this choosing by the church's agents of the workers who are to come or to go, of course there will be much of real Christian courtesy, and no little obedience to the Christian law, "In honor preferring one another." But also there can be not a little activity that will be sub-Christian.

The task of the whole church, and primarily of its most trusted and experienced leaders, is to guard against this unhappy possibility, this danger that the work of the Uniting Conference may be crippled by the aspirations of some modern sons of Zebedee seeking places near the throne.

This union of ours may be a greater matter than even enthusiastic Methodists now suspect. It has been a long time coming. It has come out of fifty years of frustration and futility, out of twenty years of hoping against hope. It has imposed a great burden of toil on a galaxy of wise and noble spirits who did not live to see the fruition of their labors. In it are the dreams of peacemakers and the fervent hopes of ardent lovers of their church. And of late has been added the desperate consciousness of many among us, that we dare no longer face a divided world with a divided church.

So much of holy passion and self-forgetting labor has marked this long history that our approach to the day of its fruition should be as to a sacrament.

The one calamity which we can and must prevent is that any should degrade the time and the event to ignoble uses.

In the secular world about us we see a generation given over to the vulgar and ignoble use of forces which could be wholly liberating and uplifting social agencies.

The brains and skill of engineers have given us the airplane, and at this moment the parks of Europe's capitals are scarred by trenches lately dug in panic fear of planes that would drop wholesale death.

Art and invention have given us the motion picture, and we let Hollywood use it to educate our children in sex and slapstick, gangsters and gun play.

Perhaps there is no great danger that so dark a prospect hangs over the crowning moments of Methodist Union. But the danger which does threaten us is of the same sort — the cheapening and commercializing of what we pray may be a mighty spiritual force.

It could be all which that implies. It could even become, as some other great councils of the church became, the occasion of bitterer strife and more subtly selfish disputing than marked the days of division. It could hinder and delay their advance toward union by other churches, which now watch us with wistful hope.

The place where the Uniting Conference will meet is used, at other times, as a business mart, a political tabernacle, and as a sports arena. Even while it is in Methodist occupancy, it *could* take on some of the marks of these other gatherings. It could be a noisily desecrated temple, filled with the clashing rivalries and conflicting jealousies of those who trade in other than spiritual merchandise.

But, if the church cares to have it so, Kansas City's Civic Auditorium can be a true place of worship, in which all American Methodism can see the Lord, high and lifted up, and being newly humble and newly bold can answer Him, out of cleansed lips, saying, "Here am I; send me!"

FRAMING MISCHIEF BY LAW

R. L. Calder, of Montreal, himself a Roman Catholic, speaking in Oshawa on the Quebec Padlock Law which was passed in half an hour, unanimously, by both houses of the Quebec legislature, merely because Cardinal Villeneuve was back of it, said of this alleged law against the teaching of Communism:

"The *Encyclopedia Britannica* says the only practical Communism is a monastic order, and had Duplessis and his lawmakers defined Communism they would have to arrest every priest, friar and monk in Quebec. The jails, of course, would not be big enough to hold them."

In this Quebec Padlock Law there is a definite, specific and overt case of "framing mischief by a law" denounced in the Scriptures, the highest law of all. Such a law is not worth the paper it is written on, and the anarchists who rely on it are clinging to a hydrogen balloon with one hand and trying to burn their way into it with a blowtorch in the other.

—Consolation.

JIM-CROW UNION?

By W. SCOTT CHINN —*A Negro faces the fact of segregation but determines nevertheless to "make good."*

As WE ENTER into unification, which provides for a separate Negro (racial) rather than a "geographical" jurisdiction as in the case of the five white jurisdictions, with ours plainly marked *"for Negroes only,"* a familiar sign in these parts, and which greatly embarrasses legitimate Negro members who are a part of the united church, we find ourselves further handicapped due to the lack of any complete *official set-up,* to take over and direct our affairs as we move into this jurisdiction. So far, nothing has been done in this direction either on our part or by those designing to *set us apart* to give us this *official set-up.* Having settled (?) the Negro question by this wicked and un-Christian *segregation* arrangement, everything seems to be taken for granted and no one seems to care whether the Negro gets off to a good start or not in his jurisdiction.

Unification, as about to be adopted and be operated, is not of the Negro's liking or choice. It is *forced* upon him and others and accepted by our group, only wth the hope that perhaps through it, both white and black may be brought face to face and made to see themselves as never before. Properly used, then, and in the spirit of Christian tolerance, we may be placed in an enviable position and thus offered a wonderful opportunity to show and prove in a definite way that if given a *chance* we will *make good.*

In the light of the recent request made by the publishing interests that "the officers, management, publishing houses, and activities shall carry on unchanged until the General Conference meets," it is quite evident that the lack of this *official set-up* on our part demands that we should seek to get it immediately upon the adjournment of the Uniting Conference. A little thought on the part of our leaders as to this *need* might have secured the same for us during the session of the Uniting Conference. Failing to do so, we should lose no time now in getting the set-up. To wait one or two years after the adjournment of the Uniting Conference, dependent upon others dictating and telling us what to do, despite the fact that we will be off in our sepa-

From THE CHRISTIAN ADVOCATE, *Southwestern Edition, February 22, 1939*

rate jurisdiction, would be foolish and child's play. If we had the official set-up like the white brethren, we might stay off an election for obvious reasons, but since we do not have anything of the kind, that makes it imperative that we take this action and secure the same *right away*.

It is useless to think of asking the Negroes to accept white supervision of any kind, other than in an advisory way, and then only upon *"invitation."* In fact, when each jurisdiction moves to itself, our white brethren are going to find themselves unusually busy adjusting their own affairs and they will not have very much time to help attend to ours. They are going to be kept pretty busy day and night, for a long time setting their own houses in order. Adopting unification will be found to be one thing; making it work quite another thing.

Our Negro Conferences should meet *right away* and elect delegates, and hold either a General Conference or a similar meeting, at such a time and place as may be decided upon, and elect our official staff to serve the general interests of the jurisdiction. With our two active bishops and one retired bishop, who can be restored to active service, we can hold such a meeting without doing violence to any fixed rule. Since the separation calls for "separate but equal accommodation," it holds that our jurisdiction will, in so far as the demands require, have everything in common with the five white jurisdictions, with the same rules applying in the operation of all alike. Each jurisdiction will work out its own local problems and adjust its own affairs, so long as there are no violations of the general rules of the united church.

The Negro jurisdiction must rise or fall as the result of the Negro's own actions. Three hundred thousand well-trained, intelligent, and forward-looking Negro men and women *can attend to their own church business, and there should be no interference whatever on the part of the white brethren as they seek to do so.*

FROM THE LIPS OF A PRIEST

By FATHER LOBO: PRIEST OF MADRID

—"Nor was this in the fifteenth century, but the twentieth."

I CONSIDER that it is my very bitter duty — a duty which I cannot decline — to speak and preach what I believe to be the truth about Spain. God is my witness that I am moved by no personal ambition, nor do I wish anything for myself. An obedient son of the Catholic Church and of the hierarchy, I claim the liberty of a human being in those matters which God has given to men to decide. The Holy Father who has just gone to his grave with a sad heart has said: "Prelates are not political hierarchs. They do not have to impose upon the faithful any obligation regarding matters pertaining to the republic and the government. When they do so it is not as pastors of Israel, and the faithful are free to accept or to decline their counsel."

It was the people who obliged me to come, "Go and speak the truth about Spain," they said. "We are hungry — we mind only for the women and the children, and the old people. But our hunger is not so much for bread as for comprehension, and we want the world to hear from the lips of a priest the meaning of our struggle, and why we are ready to die. The whole world must know that this voluntary sacrifice of a whole people is not only for material bread. It is for something far greater. It is destiny. We struggle and we die for all people, for all who suffer, for the eternal principles of liberty and of political and social justice. . ."

In the parish of the Maravillas in Madrid, an interesting episode occurred in the early part of 1937, when we were gathering together artistic and religious treasures. The Sr. Gomez Moreno, professor of the Central University of Madrid, has told me that 95% of the artistic wealth of Spain belonged to the church. Foreigners, even from Catholic countries like France, marveled at the immense quantity and the quality of the treasures in the Spanish churches. It would be absurd for a Catholic priest to censure the conduct of the church which has been able to safeguard and hand down these riches from previous generations. But the people did not eat. . . and yet, not for love of art, but rather for display,

From THE NEW MASSES, *March 7, 1939*

the greatest quantities of gold and precious stones have been amassed. These past days the crown of the Virgin of the Sacristy at Toledo has been shown on the screen. But it is no object of art handed down from past centuries, but made during the twentieth century, and it is said to have cost ten million pesetas. I was cast out from an aristocratic house in Madrid because I did not loudly praise the lady of the house for having spent 150,000 pesetas for a cape for her private oratory. My father served in that house for forty-five years. At his table he had to feed twelve children and his wage was one peseta and seventy-five centimos, at par — fifteen cents. Nor was this in the fifteenth century, but in the twentieth.

But, returning to the "Maravillas" — high up on one of the walls hung a great picture of Christ on the Cross. I thought of removing it and one of the workmen said with great decision, "No, Father Lobo, no — we are Catholics — but even if we were not — you would not take that picture away. Christ is our brother and our friend. The fascists of his day killed him, just as they would do today if He returned to preach."

There are more than sixty thousand cases of pellagra registered in Madrid. Hundreds of children at the age of four months weigh what they did at birth. Thousands and thousands of people are suffering from tuberculosis, without medicine or any aid. All this is monstrous, and it is the duty of the whole world to be aroused. I do not wish to say anything about the combatants. I am not asking for cannons, nor for machine guns, nor arms for brothers to kill each other. I ask for bread for old people and for Spanish women, milk for children and for the sick, medicines, clothing, food, all that a people needs when it is defending a cause which it believes to be just, and when it suffers a bodily and spiritual martyrdom never surpassed — nor equaled. . .

What is my opinion about the religious problem? I do not wish to speak of this difficult question. If it is always advisable to let passions cool and give time for reason to assert itself, it is particularly so in this case. I do not wish to sow more hatred, even less to fix responsibilities. From the depth of my heart, I lament those priests who have fallen and those churches which have been profaned — but I cannot raise another barrier, or open another abyss between the church and the Spanish people. Herein lies the great tragedy. They were so separated that they did not know, or love each other. The people practiced the Christian rites in the solemn moments of their lives. Children were generally christened — marriage ceremonies performed, masses said for the dead, and the people — perhaps with a greater sense of art than of Christianity — joyously celebrated the solemn feasts. Every city and small village was a miniature Seville in Holy Week. And yet they were lacking in religious instruction; nor did they live, I believe in many cases on account of ignorance, according to Christian dogma. And we priests took refuge among the wealthy classes, perhaps deserting our duty. The Spanish clergy is honest and fervent, but it was not prepared for the struggle which inevitably had to come. During one century we have had two religious wars, and unfortunately, there are many who fall into the error of regarding this as the third religious war. I leave that to their own conscience. I must honestly confess that I prefer to see a dead priest who has been assassinated, than to see one handling a gun or blessing a tank or a machine gun. They lifted up their voices in the name of their country, which according to them had been sold to Russia, and they now remain silent when it is delivered over, tied hands and feet, to the Catholic Hitler and the very Catholic Mussolini. We have just learned, through the press of the world, that the rebel Franco made his entrance into Barcelona with a great warlike display, preceded by seventy thousand Italians and escorted by Mussulmen. And still they are silent. And what of the brave boast of the defense of Spain?

How can one explain the fact of priests having been killed? And the profanation of temples? The many priests affiliated in political parties could say a very great deal — those who looked after the temporal goods of the wealthy, who served as electoral delegates at the time of voting, always against the people. Naturally, nothing justifies assassination, but the people pardon more easily a rich man than a priest for defending worldly interests, and forgetting spiritual interests. The Spanish problem is so complex that I know of villages where the president of the Catholic youth groups became, on the very first day of the rebellion, the head of the revolutionary committee.

But I do not wish to say more about this delicate and very painful subject. I have said terrible things but more than a million and a half of dead require that the truth be spoken and it is well that a priest should do so. In my possession I have the document, signed by many aristocrats, addressed to His Excellency the bishop of Madrid, in 1933, insisting upon his ordering the cloistered nuns to come out to vote because their material interests would benefit. May those priests who died in the tragic conflict rest in peace, and be a lesson that is never forgotten.

BEAUTY

Not the clear piping beauty of Sappho
Through the stone corridors of the ages;
Not the beauty of Trojan Helen
In the misty gold look about her;
Not the sweet rose-softness
That was once Susanna's beauty
Dazing the swarming eyes
Of the elders spying upon her;
No, not even Cleopatra's,
Bitter and bright as red berries
Hung from the twisted branches of all men's longing.

But the beauty of old men
Musing in chimney corners,
And the beauty of young eyes
That have buried deep their love;
And the beauty of old women
Sitting on park benches . . .
The beauty, the terrible beauty of their little folded hands.

Kay Smith.

I AM A CHAPLAIN!

By W. EDGAR GREGORY

—"Not one of us escapes war guilt."

YES! I'M IN the army. Why? Simply because I'm "from Missouri." I graduated from seminary a little over two years ago and was ordained the following year. Just the other day I was granted a commission in the Chaplains Reserves. What it will amount to only the future can tell.

And all this has happened after my serving for two years under one of the most outspoken pacifists in the country. I served my apprenticeship under a man who served with the allied forces in Siberia after the World War. I graduated also from one of the most anti-militarist seminaries in the country, and I am an ordained minister of one of the most outspoken pacifist denominations in the United States. And yet here I am enrolled in the Officers' Reserve Corps. How did I get that way?

Probably the very fact that my associations were so completely of the anti-war variety has had a great deal to do with it. I have found that, in general, it is quite easy to condemn a group with which one has little association and it is certainly true that military officers and Christian ministers are not prone to frequent the same clubs. But since I had come into the ministry as a result of a rather independent spirit I insisted upon maintaining that spirit. Brought up under conditions which did not cause me to respect the Christian ministry too highly — from the examples I had seen — and educated with a very critical attitude toward all Christian institutions my own thinking had brought me to the point where I determined to find out from the inside what the church really meant. Many of my advisers looked askance at the whole thing. In their estimation I was wasting my talents, I would probably be fitted into a mould from which my independent thinking would never more be able to break away. There was much disappointed shaking of heads, but I persisted. On so controversial a matter I was not going to depend upon men who had never had any intimate relationship to the subject. I would find out for myself. That led to my ordination.

But it did not fit me into a mould. At times, even while in seminary, I

Original Article

thought seriously of enrolling in the R. O. T. C. to learn something of the military psychology. Most of my fellow students were taking anti-war pledges and marching in anti-war parades. To me it seemed rather childish. War was only present in the abstract and such pledges mighty easy. What would happen when these same men faced the prospect of war with some definite country over some definite issue was something which gave me a great deal of thought. I even ventured to predict that many of those most active in the securing of pledges would be among the first to give way to the hysteria of war. Unfortunately my prophecy may be put to the test within the near future. Already many of these same men have become active propagandists for one side or the other in the Spanish civil war or in the Chinese war. Men who have taken the pledge never to fight in any war, are already moaning because they can't get loose to wreak havoc on Franco's armies. That's what war in the concrete has done. It's far different from the abstraction.

Unable to get into the R. O. T. C. because of the pressure of other studies, I still cherished the plan of doing something to get to know some genuine "militarists" at first hand. This opportunity presented itself recently when the Federal Council of Churches approved my application for a Reserve Officer's Commission.

What do I expect from the commission? This may best be answered by a list of expectations. Only the first I am certain of. Should that first prove unsatisfactory I might even resign the commission rather than go on. Should it prove otherwise the additional expectations may be realized.

First of all I shall obtain information. I shall learn how officers think. I shall learn in what ways their thinking differs from that of the ordinary person in civil life. I shall learn in what ways it is similar. I shall learn what is the real military attitude toward war and peace. Information is primary and all the rest is secondary. If I find what the pacifists say I shall find, I'll join their ranks immediately, but I hardly expect to find it. The average pacifist knows less about the army than the average factory owner knows about communism. He may be partly right, in which case I shall do my best to improve his information. In all probability I shall also find opportunity to improve the knowledge of the military officers as to the meaning of Christianity.

Secondly I will be enabled to reach a group of young men living a very abnormal life, many of whom have never seen the inside of a church. If I can lead them to a more wholesome life the odium incurred in becoming a "militarist" will have been repaid many times over. Christians are commanded to go forth into the highways and byways to rescue those who are perishing. Why should a man simply because he is in the army be denied the Christian ministry? Jesus came to minister to sinners, not to Pharisees. Those boys in the army are far more in need of our ministrations than are the good "saints" at home who consider themselves so perfect they couldn't be improved anyway.

Finally, I shall be helping to atone for the sins of society which make war inevitable. Those young men who go into the trenches and across no-man's land are not nearly so guilty as are those civilians who by their economic and business policies make war inevitable. It is the civilian who, by insisting upon rigid immigration restrictions, high tariffs, advantageous money markets, etc., makes war inevitable. The woman who must have her silk hose from Japanese silk and the man who must have his German camera are both guilty. Stockholders and employees alike of those companies which make money from war, and even the farmers who benefit by war prices for wheat are guilty. Not a one of us escapes. And our punishment is that our sons and brothers must go out and be butchered (or butcher) to atone for these sins. I at least can be present to help alleviate their sufferings and make their unnatural life more bearable.

Yes, "I'm from Missouri," and I'm going to find out for myself how the army man thinks, and if war really comes, I want to be where I can alleviate some of the sufferings brought so needlessly upon our young men.

War is hell, but we'll get nowhere by ignoring its existence. We've first got to recognize it and try healing its wounds, but, above all, we've got to be born anew so that our sins will not make it necessary that the flower of the land be mowed down every generation. I'm a chaplain, but I'm there to do my best to make it unnecessary to have chaplains sometime, if God's will permits.

FRANCO'S MERCY

By GEORGES BIDAULT

"—in short a law of terrorism, a law not of criminals but of suspects."

February 15, 1939

". . . . The Bulletin of Decrees issued at Burgos published on February 13 a law of the 89 articles and several annexes designed to punish what it calls "political responsibilities." This law, which has been discussed in no assembly, subjected to no control (yet they told us Nationalist Spain would not be a totalitarian state) is a signal event in the denouement of the civil war. I have no doubt that tomorrow we will find gentlemen of the pen supple enough to give us a favorable analysis of it. Let him be fooled who wishes to be fooled. But here, at least, we will continue to speak the truth and anyone who wishes to complain is free to do so.

Judging from the resume of the law which appeared in the Temps and which was the most inclusive that has appeared in Paris, this law of "political responsibilities" calls for three principle observations to be made.

1. Hypocrisy of the Preamble. The law, its exponents say, is not vindictive but constructive. It modifies the rigor of certain penalties, etc. It does, in effect, do this but only in the sense that it does not authorize the summary executions so often practiced by both sides since the beginning of the war (and even before). But it does not modify the penalties in relation to any known existing legislation for it designates as crimes, acts and even attitudes which have never anywhere before been indicted in any legislation.

2. Unspecified Crimes. All those who, since October 1, 1934, have "contributed to the subversion of which Spain was the victim" will be held to be convicted of "political responsibilities." Who, except friends of the conqueror, could hope to escape from an accusation defined with such precision? All those who belonged to the Popular Front or to its allied groups (even those who joined after July 18, 1936) or who belonged to "Separatist" organizations or who opposed the triumph of the Movement will be held to be convicted of "political responsibilities." This includes, for example, all those "who occupied executive positions in these parties and their affiliates"; all those who were

From Aube, *(Roman Catholic Daily) Paris*

Government candidates for the Cortes in 1936; all those who "organized the elections"; all those who were "electoral agents of the Popular Front." This means, in short, that everybody in the vanquished region is a suspect, everyone who belonged to any of the parties of the Left, anyone who in any way participated in politics. The text makes it possible for the law to reach even abstentionists for since the vote was by secret ballot, it becomes necessary to treat as public enemies all those who had not since 1934 or at the latest 1936 made some definite act in favor of the Insurgents.

3. The Tribunal of Repression. This comprises a president, two generals, two phalangists, two magistrates. It does not require a very critical mind to appreciate without flattery the independence of a tribunal so composed. No jury, no safeguard for the accused, no procedure for appeal.

It is a lovely thing — the clemency of a great pacifying leader.

Under the terms of this law of "political responsibilities" Daladier and Bonnet would be immediately imprisoned as having been elected by the Popular Front. What's more, even M. Pierre-Etienne Flandin himself would not escape, having flirted with the Left at a date following October 1st, 1934. And I am not joking."

February 16, 1939

". . . The Spanish papers which I have been able to obtain enable me to analyze the categories of suspects. Not only are all the Front Populaire parties placed "outside the law," not only are all deputies, candidates for deputy and their adherents belonging to the Popular Front promised punishment, but all those "who have publicly declared themselves in favor of the Popular Front or in favor of those parties proscribed in this law" and all those who "have given voluntary financial aid to those parties even without having been affiliated to them."

Beside all the Popular Front parties listed there are also the Basque Nationalists, and the Union Democratica de Catalunya — parties composed of Catholics, proclaiming and defending Christian principles whose property will be confiscated and whose members are all punishable. Also listed is the Solidarite des Travailleurs Basques which represents the only Christian trade unions really existing in Spain. Not only have these unions — the only ones, I repeat, representing the social doctrine of the Encyclicals — already had their property confiscated (to be turned over to the Phalangist Sundicates of Hitlerite inspiration) but also the militant Christian trade unionists — let me repeat for the third time — the only ones in Spain — have legally been made subject to imprisonment. Even that is not all. For the enumeration of parties and organizations in which membership is made *retroactively* punishable is completed by a clause "all other organizations filial or analogous" which makes the list applicable to any Spaniard whatsoever.

Here is a retroactive law which punishes acts in no way forbidden at the time they were committed, a law which established crimes of omission, a law which makes punishable a propaganda which was legal at the time it was made, party dues legal at the time they were made — in short a law of terrorism, a law not of criminals but of suspects, a law of iniquity.

A LINE ON OUR CONTRIBUTORS

FATHER J. F. THORNING is head of the Department of Social Sciences at Mt. St. Mary's College, Maryland. . . . PEARL S. BUCK is the well-known writer on China. . . . J. W. POYNTER is a convert from Roman Catholicism. . . . J. A. MacCALLUM is editor of the *Presbyterian Tribune*. . . . G. A. BORGESE is professor of Italian Literature at the University of Chicago. . . . JOHN van SCHAICK, Jr. is editor of the *Christian Leader*. . . . DR. A. M. SMITH is a pioneer in the good-will movement for Jews and Christians. . . . GEORGE BRITT is collaborating with Heywood Broun on a book on anti-Semitism, to be published this spring. . . . C. G: MONTEFIORE was formerly President of University College, Southampton, England. . . . DR. M. M. COADY is head of the Extension Department of St. F-X University, Nova Scotia. . . . DAN B. BRUMMITT is editor of the *tian Advocate*. . . . *W. SCOTT* Northwestern edition of the *Chris-* CHINN is a Negro writer and contributor to the *Christian Advocate*. FATHER LOBO is a Roman Catholic priest from Madrid. . . . W. EDGAR GREGORY is a young minister and writer from Concord, New Hampshire.

"It is my privilege to express a word of thanks to the editors of PROTESTANT DIGEST which attracted my attention tonight on a news stand.

"The very first chapter reads like a message from heaven. I rub my eyes and ask myself 'Is it possible?' Is it possible that there are men whose voice reaches far that now cry out into the world for their fellow men to recognize their peril and unite in the cause of justice and liberty. God speed the day when Spain will be at peace once more and live in freedom under a 'government of the people — by the people and for the people.' "

M. M. Talkin, M.D., New York, City.

"The publication of the new religious journal, PROTESTANT DIGEST, will be enthusiastically welcomed by all who sincerely desire to incarnate Christianity into their daily living. Too long have we Protestants given lip-service to Christianity; too little have we let it become the dominant factor of our lives.

"Backed by a brilliant editorial policy, each issue of this new paper is more than a digest. It is a living incarnation of Christianity, a call to constructive action!"

Fred E. Ellis
Assistant, Harvard Observatory

"The PROTESTANT DIGEST has come before me for the first time.

"Constantly throughout the pages of the current issue, the Roman Catholic Church is referred to as simply the Catholic Church. This is very misleading and entirely erroneous. Also it is difficult to understand why a Protestant journal allows such errors. It is bad enough when Roman Catholics seek to dispense with their true Roman identification."

Paul Longley, Whycocomagh, Nova Scotia.

"I have been reading your excellent publication the PROTESTANT DIGEST, and the more I read it the more I like it. As an American Baptist of Italian origin, I have found that it answers a long felt demand particularly among my own people. It is religious, cultural, educational and, what's more, it expresses beautifully the implications of the Baptist tradition. No Italian Protestant clergyman, who wants to keep abreast of the contemporary life and thought at their best, should go without this most excellent monthly."

Rev. Theodore DeLuca, Wakefield, Mass.

THEOLOGY

THE HEART beats slowly, strongly,
Whipping the star-bright blood,
Sending it forth in flood,
The heart beats slowly, strongly.

The lung has logic, surely,
Finding in air its due,
Sifting the false from true,
The lung has logic, surely.

The brain goes asking, wrongly,
Why this engulfing surge,
Wherefore this lashing urge,
The brain goes asking, wrongly.

The hand moves freely, purely,
Breaking the brain's dark vow,
Quick on the wheel and plough
The hand moves freely, purely.

One is their master, only,
Knowing himself as one,
Dream and the dream undone,
One is their master only.

Ruthless he is, and tender,
Treading the stars above,
Knowing himself in love,
Ruthless he is, and tender.

—K. L.

A Must Magazine

For All Thinking People--

PROTESTANT DIGEST

The Spearhead of Protestant Thought and Action

The Presbyterian Tribune says-

"No one who seeks to keep in touch with current religious thought can afford to ignore this excellent vehicle of information and inspiration."

Zion's Herald says-

"- - an excellent piece of work . . . the beginning of a new venture in religious journalism."

The Christian Register says-

"The Protestant Digest is being edited by a man who will not be afraid to deal with the "hot spots" in the religious news of the day."

WE SAY -- Join the thousands of enthusiastic readers who begin to see that Protestant Digest is **"not just another magazine"** but is the sound of a voice long **silent in this land.**

We wish to secure reliable Protestant workers to introduce Protestant Digest to Church people everywhere. Liberal commissions allowed Church Societies and individuals. For particulars write PROTESTANT DIGEST - 14 Beacon St., Boston.

Subscribe Now on the Convenient Form Below
Rate - 1 Year - $3.00 2 Years - $5.00

SUBSCRIPTION ORDER FORM

Protestant Digest, Inc.
14 Beacon Street
Boston, Mass.

Kindly enter my subscription to Protestant Digest for ....
I enclose check (money order) to cover cost at the rate quoted above.

Name ....

Address ....

City ....State ....

PROTESTANT DIGEST

Heralds The Call For PROTESTANT ACTION

THINK

The world stands on the brink of disaster. On the one side the forces of destruction and FASCISM - and on the other progress, science and Christianity.

ACT

Intelligent Protestants must unite today to preserve freedom of worship, freedom of speech, freedom of the press - and all democratic institutions.

If we are to save our country from the terrible fate which hangs over it, we must bring the great motivating forces of Protestantism to the service of Democracy. It is to this end that the Protestant Digest is dedicated.

SPECIAL INTRODUCTORY OFFER

Five Monthly Issues by Mail - $1.00

Protestant Digest, Inc.
14 Beacon Street
Boston, Mass.

Please send me the PROTESTANT DIGEST by mail for five months, for which I enclose $1.00

Name ______________________________

Address ______________________________

City ________________ State ________________

NOTICE

The Board of Christian Education of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America has announced a campaign to raise ten million dollars which is designated as the Sesquicentennial Fund. This fund is entirely for Christian education and will be used to stabilize the financial condition of 53 Presbyterian colleges and 52 Westminster foundations at State Universities as well as establish new centers at other universities.

These colleges and Presbyterian centers are the recruiting ground for Christian leaders, and if democracy is to survive, the Board has realized that it is absolutely necessary to strengthen Christian forces in education.

READ

A history of the formative centuries of the Christian Church that can be trusted. Parallel time-maps, secular and ecclesiastic, make it uniquely valuable for reference. —*The First Five Centuries of the Church,* by James Moffat. Cokesbury Press, $2.00

Surrender to the Creative Spirit (God) rules out each and every desire (for money, fame, respectability, etc.) or fear (of death or punishment or shame, etc.) Incomplete surrender is never permanent. It always turns into one of the desires or fears. An "either-or" book. . . How we need it! —*Purity of Heart is to Will One Thing,* by Soren Kierkegaard. Translated with foreword by Douglas V. Steere. Harper and Brothers, New York, $2.00

This bold, hard, clean book shows how a world can disintegrate through dishonesty, and how a world can be rebuilt through "creative honesty." —*Honesty,* by Richard C. Cabot. Macmillan Co., New York, $2.50

Protestantism, not being quite the corpse Maritain thinks it is, can learn much from the Maritain who teaches the true humanism grounded and centered in God. His hope that Russia will shape a "new Christendom" we share. —*True Humanism,* by Jacques Maritain. Charles Scribner's Sons, New York, $3.50

Timely for the historic Uniting Conference of the Methodist Churches is the story of how, slowly but irresistably the essential magnet is drawing together the great scattered children of Wesley. —*The Methodists Are One People,* by Paul Neff Garber. Cokesbury Press, $1.00

LOST TRIBE

(Showing no name and flying no flag, a tramp steamer, destination unknown, has sailed from Danzig carrying 500 Jews, who may be refused a landing anywhere.)

Whither are you sailing, nameless ship,
With no flag flying?
What men are you carrying this trip,
The living or the dying?

But through the homeless seas
That burn or freeze
She goes in shame, the ship that has no name,
Without replying.

For what port, what haven far or near,
Can you be hieing?
In what harbour, next week or next year
Will you be lying?

Bearing a tribe long-lost
From coast to coast
She goes in shame, the ship that has no name,
Without replying.

Is it wind that whistles in your wake,
Or old men sighing?
Is it seafowl screaming in your wake,
Or babes and women crying?

By the lorn voices wrung
Of old and young
She goes in shame, the ship that has no name,
Without replying.

—Tomfool, *Reynolds News*